CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

Cornell University Library

THE GIFT OF

Professor R. P. Bowen

A 363142

5/X/16

2041

Cornell University Library
BT871 .B78
Resurrection in the New Testament; an ex
3 1924 029 319 724
olin

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924029319724

Crown Theological Library

This series has been instituted to present a religious literature dealing with modern difficulties; the thinking man needs books on a subject so vital as that of religious thought, which take into account all that is most valuable and trustworthy in modern research. The volumes comprising the "Crown Theological Library" have been selected with a view of meeting the religious questionings of the present age, and each contribution has been prepared by an acknowledged authority on the subject with which it deals. The standpoint of the series is at once reverent and liberal. Its object is to combine respect for religion with respect for historic and scientific truth, and to present a series of studies on the great problems of human life which are free from all dogmatic prepossessions.

The Resurrection in the New Testament

An Examination of the Earliest References to the Rising of Jesus and of Christians from the Dead

By

Clayton R. Bowen, A.B., B.D.

Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Meadville Theological School

G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York and London
The Knickerbocker Press
1911

A 363142

Copyright, 1911
by
CLAYTON RAYMOND BOWEN

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

DB

To

MY COLLEAGUES

IN THE FACULTY

OF THE

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

FOREWORD

THE present work, the first-fruits of the author's New Testament studies, is offered to other students in the hope that it may contribute something to an understanding of the New Testament references to the event which looms largest in the minds of the writers of both Gospels and Epistles. It is thus essentially a work of exegesis.

The foot-notes, added for the most part as the result of collateral reading done after the substance of the volume was complete, may serve as a guide in the further study of particular points, and as in some degree a control on the author's exegesis. He regrets that he was unable to use several important recent works.

The author would express his gratitude for helpful counsel and suggestions to his colleagues Francis A. Christie, D.D. and Henry Preserved Smith, D.D., and to Professor Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel of Zürich. Especially would he acknowledge the unfailing assistance of his wife, without whose encouragement the book would not have progressed to publication.

Any corrections or criticisms which other students of the material may be good enough to offer will be gratefully received.

C. R. B.

WARREN, NEW HAMPSHIRE,
September 12, 1911.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

BOOK ONE.—THE WITNESS OF PAUL

CHAPTER

I.—HE DIED, WAS BURIED, WAS RAISED 5

II.—HE APPEARED 41

III.—HOW ARE THE DEAD RAISED? . . 70

IV.—PAUL'S FURTHER WITNESS . . 116

BOOK TWO.—THE WITNESS OF MARK

V.—THE ATTESTATION 150

VI.—WHO SHALL ROLL AWAY THE STONE? 183

VII.—THE EMPTY GRAVE 206

BOOK THREE.—THE WITNESS OF MATTHEW

VIII.—JERUSALEM 238

IX.—GALILEE 275

BOOK FOUR.—THE WITNESS OF LUKE

X.—OUTSIDE THE CITY 290

CHAPTER PAGE

XI.—THEN TO THE TWELVE . . . 333

XII.—THE FORTY DAYS 374

BOOK FIVE.—THE WITNESS OF JOHN AND OTHERS

XIII.—THE FOURTH GOSPEL . . . 389

XIV.—THE FINAL WITNESS . . . 399

BOOK SIX.—RESULTS

XV.—TIME AND PLACE 428

XVI.—JESUS THE MESSIAH 441

APPENDIX 459

LIST OF WORKS MOST FREQUENTLY CITED 481

INDEX 487

The Resurrection in the New Testament

The Resurrection in the New Testament

INTRODUCTION

IT is impossible to overestimate the importance of the resurrection-faith, either in itself or in its relation to that movement of religion we call Christianity. The words of Paul of Tarsus have a truth that is often mistaken by traditionalists and liberals alike. "If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised, and if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain . . . ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in this life only we have hoped in Christ we are of all men most pitiable." The apostle has not overstated the case; if it be true that Jesus is at this moment *a dead man*, if no resurrection came to him—yes, if it be true that any departed soul is at this moment *a dead man*, if for but a single one there has been no resurrection—then is the Christian preaching and the Christian faith vain. The Christian religion, whatever be true of others, conceives man as an eternal child of an eternal Father, and death as but an incident in the development of an enduring spirit. The Christian church must affirm the resurrection-faith.

For obvious reasons the church has from the beginning affirmed this high faith by affirming the resurrection as realised in the after-death experience of the founder of the church. This procedure is most natural and proper, and the affirmation has thus been given infinitely more power than it would have had as a universal statement of what is true for men in general. It is true, to use Martineau's fine words, that the dependence of the disciples' "faith in immortality on the irresistible suasion of a single supreme and winning personality explains the order of *their* inference, from the one to the many, 'because he lives, we shall live also'; whereas *we* should more naturally say, 'because man is immortal, he is in heaven, a chief among souls,' seeming to reason from the many to the one. Yet I know not whether, so far as there is difference, theirs be not deeper truth. For surely with all of us it holds good, that only through the presence of spirits akin to his, does any diviner world of human possibility, any inward demand on life eternal, open upon us and plead in our prayers. All our higher faith enters as we stand before those saintly and commanding natures to which perishable attributes refuse to cleave, and fall off, like the moss and mould from the finest marble, leaving the form clear against the stainless sky. As their silent appeal finds the spiritual deeps within us, it is from them that we draw the faith in immortality, and learn to deem nothing too august for a soul of such high vocation."[1]

These words may serve as a justification of the present inquiry into the primitive records of the

[1] Martineau, pp. 364 f.

conviction among Jesus' earliest followers that, having died, he was yet not dead. This conviction, vigorously and fearlessly asserted, was, it can scarcely be denied, incomparably the greatest contribution ever made to the faith in the soul's immortality. Never in all history, before or since, has there been such absolute assurance of the persistence of a human life beyond the gates of death. These disciples were so sure, that their surety has largely sufficed for the world these many centuries. That is a great and notable fact; therein is the ancient word true, "he brought life and immortality to light."

Confronted by the phenomenon, the student of religion asks: what was the stimulating cause of that sure conviction in that group of men and women in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago? The student of history asks: what is the truth concerning the sensible phenomena recorded in the gospels and by the common usage of the church made the substance of the resurrection? The following discussion would be a contribution to the answering of these two questions. Its purpose is not to argue the fundamental proposition as to the possibility or probability of the intrusion into the history of the first century of the literal supernatural phenomena described by the evangelists. The time is past for such discussion, even if it were ever waged with profit. A believer, the God of whose worship uses such methods in his dealings with the souls of men, who lives in a world where such phenomena are historically conceivable and religiously valuable, is not to be given another mind by argumentation. The world and the individual adjust themselves by the sure processes of

slow growth to the new heavens and the new earth. These processes seem to work in the main by indirection, and not to be greatly helped or hindered by all our ardent disputation.

In any case, the man of the twentieth century must be dissuaded from arguing against the miracles associated with the physical resurrection by the remembrance that the critical first four centuries of the church's life exhausted all such argument. Nothing can be said to-day that was not said then, by Trypho or Celsus or Porphyry or some other of the critics of the Christian preaching. Nothing is more sobering for the modern critic than a study of the fathers.[1] An impressive and instructive example of what is meant may be found in the twenty-second book of Augustine's *Civitas Dei*, notably the fifth chapter, and chapters eleven to twenty-one. If modern apologetic must often go another way than Augustine's, modern criticism must still more definitely part company with his opponents.

Finally, for the sake of clearness, the following elements, usually implied in the term, "the resurrection," may be distinguished.

1. The present and eternal life of Jesus.

2. The transition from his earthly life through the experience of death into his present eternal life. This is "the resurrection," in its original sense.

3. The reviving of Jesus' dead body, and its emergence from the tomb. This is "the resurrection," as understood by the popular theology.

4. The physical phenomena, extending over forty days, associated with this revived body

[1] For this primitive criticism, *cf.* Bauer, pp. 479–484.

BOOK ONE

THE WITNESS OF PAUL

CHAPTER I

HE DIED, WAS BURIED, WAS RAISED

THE data concerning the primitive Christian faith as to the resurrection of Jesus are to be found: first, in the letters of Paul; second, in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; third, in the Gospel of John and the later New Testament literature; fourth, in certain extra-canonical gospel material.[1]

Of these groups of documents, the first two are in every way most important; the other two can at best do little more than confirm the witness of these. As first in rank, from every point of view, stand the letters of Paul. It is from him alone that we get any first-hand testimony; he tells us what he himself had experienced, as well as of the experience of men with whom he had personal acquaintance. His testimony is by many years the earliest left for us, and is the

[1] For a list of the sources, *cf.* A. Harnack: "Ein jüngst entdeckter Auferstehungsbericht," p. 1, in *Theologische Studien B. Weiss Dargebracht*, 1897.

spontaneous utterance of an active preacher and missionary who had a larger part than any other one man in fixing the faith of the earliest churches. For many of these churches he was almost the sole source of belief in these matters.

In all the apostle's letters, from I. Thessalonians (*ca.* 54) to Philippians (*ca.* 63), there is abundant testimony to his faith. It glows on every page; open Paul anywhere and he gives glad utterance to his sense of the nearness of Jesus and of his present power and influence as a constant friend and companion. And yet he is talking of a dead man, a man who has been dead for a quarter of a century, a man he never knew, or even saw, so far as we know, in the flesh. Yet of no living man does he speak with such absolute assurance of close and sweet communion. We believe in immortality, we believe our dead are living, but we never speak of the dearest departed with such radiant certainty and sense of nearness as does Paul of Jesus.

At this day it surely need not be pointed out that Paul is here giving utterance, not to theological formulations, but to an intensely real and vital personal experience, as real as his friendship with Timothy or Titus, nay, more real than this. "*Christ lives in me*"—this is not said of a dead man or of a theological figure. "*I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more,*"—this is vital truth for Paul and he has made it vital truth for thousands more.

Of the great apostle's references to what he calls the resurrection of Jesus the fullest is that in

I. Corinthians xv.[1] It is noteworthy that in this classic passage Paul does not in any way describe, or even define, the resurrection; he rather takes it for granted, deals with it as a matter accepted by his readers as fully as by himself. The very existence of the church was its guarantee; to be a Christian was, by hypothesis, to have the faith that Jesus rose from the dead. Nowhere does the New Testament hint that *any Christian* doubted this fact; least of all the passage in question. It is only the fact that the Corinthian skeptics held to the resurrection of Jesus while doubtful of the resurrection for all Christians, that makes Paul's argument so powerful as a *reductio ad absurdum*.[2]

The passage gives no description of the resurrection,

[1] Certain scholars, among them:—J. W. Straatman: *Kritische Studien over I. Cor.*, vol. ii., 1865, pp. 196 ff.; Rudolf Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1888, pp. 180–191; the author of *The Four Gospels as Historical Records*, 1895, pp. 475–480; W. C. Van Manen, *Paulus*, 3d ed., 1896, pp. 67 ff.; N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905, pp. 200, 395–397, on different premises, and Paul Le Breton, *La Résurrection du Christ*, 1908, p. 51, on no premises at all, have argued that the account in I. Cor. xv: 1–11 is wholly or in part not from Paul's pen. Their very insufficient arguments are abundantly answered by Schmiedel, cols. 4055–6, and by Brandt, pp. 422–427. But Brandt himself, on wholly insufficient grounds, thinks (p. 14) "then to the Twelve" an interpolation. Wilhelm Seufert, *Ursprung und Bedeutung des Apostolates*, 1887, also calls εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα "vielleicht eine uralte Glosse," as occurring "an dieser einzigen, im Text vielleicht verdorbenen, Stelle" (pp. 46, 20). In reply, *cf.* also A. Hausrath, *Jesus und die N. T. Schriftsteller*, 1908, vol. i., pp. 100 f.; Völter, pp. 32 f., regards vs. 7 as interpolated.

[2] A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Revised ed., 1900, p. 309, erroneously supposes the Corinthians to deny the resurrection of Jesus.

then, and no definition of it. This is a fact too often overlooked. The most careful and sincere students often carry over into *the word* "resurrection," as used by Paul, *the definition* which the gospel narratives have given them. Warnings against this error of method have been frequent, but all too often fruitless. Let us again, then, make the attempt to read what Paul says, in entire forgetfulness of the evangelists' record, as if we had never seen nor heard of that. It may not be easy, but it can be done.

Of course this will not be quite synonymous with reading Paul's letter as its first recipients read it, for they had heard Paul's preaching on the subject; yet certainly Paul's preaching was one in substance with what he here writes, however more elaborated. He expressly says (vss. 1 f.) that he is here giving his message "with what word" he had earlier preached it to these same Corinthians, and later (vs. 11) even more definitely, "so we preached and so ye believed," where the "we" asserts that the Twelve were at one with Paul in their teaching on this point.

We get here, therefore, an express statement, not only concerning Paul's own thought of the resurrection, but also concerning the conception and the tradition of the earliest church, and of those very disciples to whom were granted the "appearances" which comprised all that was directly known concerning the resurrection. Whatever we can demonstrate to have been Paul's belief, we can unhesitatingly attribute to Peter, James, and John, to "all the apostles."[1]

Since I. Corinthians was in all probability written

[1] *Cf.* Schmiedel, col. 4062*e*. "There is not the slightest diffi-

about the year 57, we have thus explicit statement as to what the primitive church believed and taught, from a date only twenty-seven years after the events, fifteen years before Mark wrote, forty years before Matthew and Luke wrote, and a whole half-century earlier than the drawing of those pictures of the primitive church which the Book of Acts presents. The importance of determining Paul's faith is clear. He was preaching with his whole soul a gospel of the resurrection; that was the gospel in which the converts stood, by which they were being saved. And what was that gospel's content? We shall see by setting the passage before us, in a translation as true as possible to the purport of the original.

"I make known to you, brothers, the gospel which we proclaimed (lit. *gospelled*) to you, which also you accepted, in which also you have taken your stand, through which also you are being saved, with the very language with which we proclaimed it to you, if you hold it firmly, [as you must] unless you believed carelessly. For I handed on to you among my first instructions that which I also received: that Messiah died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third

culty in attributing to them the conception of the resurrection body of Jesus which Paul himself had and attributed to them." Riggenbach, pp. 9 f., has well expressed the agreement here between Paul and the Twelve. Paul has opportunity, during his fortnight's visit to Jerusalem in the year 38 (Gal. i: 18 f.), to hear from Peter and James the story of their own experiences, and of those of the others. So Korff, pp. 12 f., though "Wirt" (p. 13) says perhaps too much. *Cf.* also Weizsäcker, p. 4: "Es ist die Urgemeinde selbst, welcher eine solche Überlieferung [of the empty grave and the bodily manifestations] fremd war."

day according to the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve; thereupon he appeared to over five hundred brothers at once, of whom the majority survive until now, but some have been laid to sleep. Thereupon he appeared to James, then to the apostles all. And last of all, as to an untimely birth, he appeared also to me."

The language is explicit and clear, despite the length of the sentence. Paul had delivered first of all, among the earliest and most elementary features of his message, the thing which also had been handed down to him as the centre and certification of the Christian faith, the proclamation of the Messiah's death and resurrection. How terse the statement: that he hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures. In what fashion? Amid what circumstances? Paul does not indicate by so much as a word, but passes at once to occurrences subsequent to the resurrection.

One phrase, however, arrests our attention, the phrase "according to the Scriptures." It occurs twice in the context. He "died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and he "was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." These two clauses, parallel as they are in form, are parallel also in thought. In each case, though grammatically the phrase "according to the Scriptures" modifies the verb and the full clause, yet the thought in Paul's mind makes it modify the adverbial phrases "for our sins" and "on the third day."[1] That Jesus died is a well-known

[1] Beyschlag, in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1899, p. 510, would regard it as "wahrscheinlicher" that *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* refers only to the verbs "buried" and "raised," not to *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ*.

fact of recent history; that he died *for our sins* is a statement of faith, based on Scripture. That he was raised from the dead Paul knows on the evidence of his own senses; that he was raised *on the third day* he is assured by Scripture.[1] Neither he nor any one else witnessed the resurrection; it was a transaction within what we may call, for lack of a more convenient term, the spirit-world, and there could be no possible external attestation of its date, save as it must have been prior to the first "appearance" of the risen Master.[2]

Granting that the tomb was found empty at daybreak on Sunday, who was to say, unless the time was antecedently fixed by prophecy, that its occupant departed during the last twelve hours, rather than during Friday night or Saturday, especially since the grave can hardly have been visited, or at least closely observed, on Sabbath? That no one ever suggested even the possibility that the resurrection took place before six o'clock of Saturday evening shows clearly how the point of time stood antecedently fixed, quite independent of the finding of the empty grave. That no human eye saw Jesus rise never caused any Christian to be of doubtful mind as to when that rising took place. The date needed not anxiously to be inquired after; it was fixed long ago in the divine

[1] So William Mackintosh, *Natural History of the Christian Religion*, 1894, p. 271, and (uncertainly) Lake, p. 29.

[2] *Cf.* D. F. Strauss, in *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theol.*, 1863, p. 389, and Arnold Meyer, p. 216. "The day of the resurrection itself could not be an object of knowledge. The third day is therefore only a deduction from prophecy or the popular habit of speech or thought."

Similarly, *Supernatural Religion*, Popular Ed., 1902, p. 890.

counsels and foretold in the prophetic word. Without definite historical attestation, it was a part of the dogma of the resurrection.

In all Paul's reading of the Old Testament before his conversion he had of course never found what he now claimed to be written there. But when he became a Christian, thereby making his own the faith that Jesus rose, he at once believed also that he rose on the third day, as the Scriptures declared. The rising, its date, and the prophecy of the date were inseparable in his mind, parts of one object of faith. This new light on Scripture he had of course "received," as he received all he knew of Jesus, from the Christian group whose nucleus was formed by the disciples.

But the disciples, in turn, had not themselves made the sudden discovery that the Old Testament fixed the third day for the resurrection of their Master. It was not that they ascertained from some external happening, such as the finding the grave empty, that he had risen between Friday evening and Sunday morning, and then, turning to the Scriptural oracles to fix the time more exactly between these limits, lighted on passages which pointed conclusively to the hours after six of Saturday evening.[1] No, the disciples knew definitely, weeks before Jesus' death, that the time for his rising was fixed by the Scripture as the third day from his decease. The Master himself had so declared.

[1] This would seem to be the view of Lake (*cf.* p. 254), though he is so judicial as not always to decide with definiteness between several possible constructions. Clemen, p. 202, points out that the third day cannot possibly be a *vaticinium ex eventu*. So Korff, pp. 112 f.

That is, the mind that first found this date prophesied was not that of Paul, not that of any one of the Twelve, but that of Jesus. The original discovery, so to speak, is his. He communicated it to his disciples, who, as soon as they were assured that Jesus had risen, adopted the date as a part of their faith, and made it an integral part of the "tradition" they handed on to Paul and to every member of the growing Christian church. In no Christian mind was Jesus' resurrection ever conceived apart from this date, and the date's Scriptural fixing. But it is clear that the date is entirely independent of any external happenings or experiences, such as the discovery that the grave no longer held the body, or the appearances of the risen Jesus himself. Conceivably the discovery of the grave as empty might have been delayed for days or weeks; a hundred chances of circumstance might have caused that, such as the early flight of the women, with the disciples, from the city, or the departure of Joseph of Arimathea to his home. According to our (synoptic) sources it is the fortuitous circumstance that haste prevented the anointing of the body before burial, that caused the women to make the morning excursion that led to the great discovery. Altogether too much weight is put by most writers on the fact that this discovery is made on the third day, rather than later. Its significance would have been precisely the same, so far as concerns the date of the resurrection, had it been made by other persons on another errand, a week or a fortnight later. So the first appearances of the risen Jesus might have come seven days or ten days or forty days after the fatal Friday; Paul and the disciples

would still have proclaimed: he rose the third day according to the Scriptures. Had no experience at the grave or no sight of the risen form of the Master given them outward assurance of his resurrection, they would still have said: "He *was* to rise the third day according to the Scriptures—only we know not if he did." Not the date of the event would be for a moment in question, but the event itself, and the first appearance, however late it came, would assure them: on the third day he did rise, as he said. No day nearer the manifestations would for an instant come into consideration. The date, in short, depends originally on Jesus' word alone.[1]

With Jesus it had been a religious certainty that God would not leave him among the dead, but would raise him to new life, new embodiment, in order that he might return to accomplish his Messianic mission. And he assigned a date to that resurrection; not now as a religious conviction, not from a revelation, but rather on the basis of Old Testament passages which he interpreted Messianically. For him all his fate was foreshadowed in his people's sacred books. "How is it written of the Son of Man? That he should suffer many things and be set at naught" (Mk. ix: 12). It was written that his disciples should at the last forsake him and flee (Mk. xiv: 27). To almost every declaration of the fate he saw awaiting him he added the triumphant assurance of the speedy escape from death.[2] The bright side of the picture

[1] Despite the questionings of certain critics, the predictions of his resurrection by Jesus are in substance genuine. For the argument, *cf. infra*, pp. 444–452.

[2] *E.g.*, Mark viii: 31; ix: 9, 31; x: 33 f.

he assuredly found in the Scriptures, as he did the darker side; for him, not only for Luke (xxiv: 46), "it stood written, that the Messiah should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day."[1]

But what and where are the Scriptural prophecies of the resurrection and its date? Paul, we must suppose, had in mind such passages as Jesus had indicated, and his own close study of the sacred text may very well have added other confirmatory allusions, which had not occurred to Jesus. The probability is that for Jesus one or two fairly definite passages would suffice to give all the assurance he needed, for he was *already convinced of the fact.* The faith was prior; the Scripture confirmation sought and found later, necessary perhaps, but secondary.

It is thus an inaccuracy to say that Jesus believed that he would rise on the third day because the Scriptures so foretold. Rather the Scripture contained for him this prediction because he already believed. Indeed, it is inaccurate to say that the disciples or Paul or the earliest Christians dated the resurrection on the third day because the Scriptures so foretold. Their belief rested on the fact that Jesus so foretold, though without his word it is possible that their study of the Scripture would have led them to the same result, if the first "appearances" or other experiences that attested his rising came soon after the third day. It is therefore quite beside the point when critics urge that the Old Testament does not contain passages sufficient in number or definiteness to induce, in the mind of Paul or of any primitive

[1] *Cf.* H. H. Wendt, *System der Christlichen Lehre*, 1907, vol. ii., p. 394.

Christian, the belief that the third day saw Jesus risen.[1] Urging this, they insist that Paul, despite his own statement, must rest his conviction of the resurrection date on some external fact known to him, such as the experience of the women at the grave.

To this it must be replied that it is hardly allowable to reject the reason Paul does give for his faith, and substitute one he does not give. Further, modern critics sometimes forget with how utterly different eyes from our own Jews of Paul's generation read the Old Testament. Because there is not for us sufficiently clear allusion there to one or another point of faith, it by no means follows that such indication was lacking to the apostle and his contemporaries.[2] We should never, unaided, have found in Genesis xiii: 15, the allusion to Messiah which Paul finds there in Galatians iii: 16, nor in the numeral of Genesis xiv: 14 the prediction of Jesus' crucifixion which is so clear to Pseudo-Barnabas (ix: 8). Compared with these "prophecies," the Scriptural announcement of Jesus'

[1] Urged, *e.g.*, by R. J. Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, 1892, p. 365; W. Beyschlag, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, p. 510; von Dobschütz, pp. 12 f.; Maurenbrecher, pp. 61 f.; and (less strongly) Lake, p. 32.

So, too, the above considerations will explain why Paul does not explicitly quote the O. T. texts which point to the third day, why no N. T. writer or early father, not even Justin, quotes, *e.g.*, Hos. vi: 2. This latter objection is strongly urged by Loofs, p. 13.

[2] *Cf.* Lake, pp. 31 f. This critic does not make sufficient use of his very telling suggestion, "if we try to discover what evidence from the Old Testament St. Paul used to prove that the death of Christ was 'for our sins,' we do not find it very easy to show that he relied on evidence which strikes us as particularly convincing."

resurrection on the third day is plainness itself. For in each case the belief is antecedent to the confirmation of the belief through the interpretation of a sacred text.

We may grant the possibility (which is far from a certainty) that the Scripture could not have induced in Paul, without some further suggestion, the belief in question. It does not matter whether or no it *could* have done so; in any case it *did not* do so. Jesus, believing himself God's chosen Messiah, sees death a growing certainty before him. He accepts death, then, as a part of God's plan, serenely confident that it cannot hold him or obstruct his appointed destiny. Speedily he shall escape from death and rise into heaven, whence he shall come in glory to set up the kingdom. Times and seasons, days and hours, he knows not; only he is sure he shall not so long be held of death as to give the power of the enemy any triumph over him and his Father's cause. An inappreciable interval, then; and now the Scripture and the thought of his people shape for him the phrase in which he describes that interval. The thought once fixed in his mind, every Scriptural allusion to a speedy triumph, or a renewal, on the third day, takes on a new and specific significance for him. To his disciples he communicates this conviction that on the third day he shall rise again from the dead according to the Scriptures, and the date is thus *fixed* on the basis of the prophetic text. The third day is thus not a product of the Old Testament oracles, but, once believed in by Jesus, is quickly found among them.[1]

[1] Not infrequently, in the case of gospel events which came to pass that one or another Scripture might be fulfilled, the Scripture

The thought of his people is above indicated as one of the influences which gave Jesus the precise limitation of the third day after death for his resurrection. We may probably go farther, and say that this precise limitation was in the first instance actually the suggestion of his people's thought.[1] The interval he naturally thinks as brief as possible; only let death actually ensue, and then, at once, escape. Now, "the third day" seems to have been a sort of colloquial or proverbial expression for "immediately," "after the briefest interval." Jesus obviously uses it thus in Luke xiii: 32, "Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected," and in the genuine saying which lies behind the declaration of the temple's destruction and its rebuilding "in three days" (Mark xiv: 58, xv: 29; Mat. xxvi: 61, xxvii: 40; John ii: 19 f.). Hosea vi: 2 also clearly means the words in this general sense. The phrase, therefore, is natural for Jesus in this connection. He might use it simply as an equivalent for "soon," after the fashion of Hosea vi: 2, and in this sense declare that he would rise on the third day.

But it appears almost certain that he used the

proof was similarly the consequent of the belief, not its antecedent, as, since Strauss, has been commonly urged. The virgin birth is a case in point. To be sure, the relation is frequently the reverse one. *Cf.* Wellhausen, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 95, note 2.

[1] So S. A. Fries, "Jesu Vorstellung von der Auferstehung der Toten," in *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wiss.*, vol. i., p. 301. A similar suggestion already in H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. vi., 3d ed., 1868, p. 80 (Eng. tr., vol. vii., 1885, p. 60). *Cf.* also Bousset, p. 342, note: "Von hier vielleicht der Ursprung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung des Herrn am dritten Tage oder nach 3 Tagen deutlich wird."

phrase, as did the disciples and all the early Christians, in its literal sense. For it seems to have been a popular belief among the Jews of Jesus' time that the soul lingers about the dead body until the third day after death, unwilling to depart while there is any possibility of reanimation. On the third day, in that climate, decay sets in, and the soul no longer waits.[1] That is, actual death is not present until the third day, for death means the soul's entire abandonment of the body, a point marked by the beginning of decomposition. A resurrection before the third day, therefore, would not be, in the complete sense, a resurrection from death, or from the dead—that is, from the underworld, for the soul has not yet quitted this world. This idea seems to be alluded to several times in the Talmudic and later Rabbinical literature. Perhaps its clearest expression is in the tractate *Moëd Katon*, iii. "According to Rabbi Abba bar Rabbi Papa, and Rabbi Joshua of Sichnin in the name of Rabbi Levi, the soul hovers during the three days above the body; she thinks to return into it again, but when she sees that its face is changed, she leaves it, and departs."[2]

This conception, like others, seems to have come into Jewish thought from Persian sources. It is to

[1] *Cf.* John xi: 39.

[2] The two first-named rabbis belong to the fourth century A.D., Rabbi Levi to the third. I have translated from the German as given by Ernst Böklen: *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der Parsischen Eschatologie*, 1902, p. 27. Böklen's section, "Die drei Tage nach dem Tode" (pp. 27–31), is of the greatest value in this connection. *Cf.* also Bousset, p. 341; Arnold Meyer, p. 182, *note;* Schmidt, pp. 320 f., *note;* S. A. Fries, *Zeitschrift N. T. Wiss.*, vol. i., p. 298; Edersheim, pp. 324 f., 631, with the rabbinical references there given.

be found several times, in one expression or another, in the Avestan literature. In the Vendîdâd we read of the dead man, "when the man is dead, when his time is over, then the hellish, evil-doing Daêvas assail him; and when the third night is gone, when the dawn appears and brightens up, and makes Mithra, the god with beautiful weapons, reach the all-happy mountains, and the sun is rising, then the fiend, named Vîzaresha, carries off in bonds the souls of the wicked Daêva-worshippers who live in sin."[1]

This has an interesting parallel among Jewish sources in an anonymous apocalyptic fragment published by Professor Steindorff, and dated by him in the first century B.C. There we read of countless frightful demons, who are described as "the servants of the whole creation, who come to the souls of the godless, carry them away and put them down here; for three days they hover around in the air with them, before they take them and throw them into their everlasting punishment."[2]

There is another passage of the Zend-Avesta in which the idea of the three-day interval between death and the definitive departing of the soul from earth to its place of punishment or reward comes to interesting expression. According to the arrangement in Westergaard's edition, it is a part of Yasht 22, and reads as follows: "Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: O Ahura Mazda, most beneficent Spirit, Maker of the Material

[1] Fargard xix : 28. The translation is that by James Darmesteter in *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv., p. 212.

[2] Georg Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias*, etc. Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge, Band II., 1899. The translation is a literal rendering of Steindorff's German translation of the Coptic text, p. 150.

World, thou Holy One! When one of the faithful departs this life, where does his soul abide on that night? Ahura Mazda answered: It takes its seat near the head, singing the Ustavaiti Gâtha and proclaiming happiness: Happy is he, happy the man whoever he be, to whom Ahura Mazda gives the full accomplishment of his wishes! On that night his soul tastes as much of pleasure as the whole of the living world can taste.

On the second night where does his soul abide? Ahura Mazda answered . . . [as before]. On the third night where does his soul abide? Ahura Mazda answered . . . [as before]. At the end of the third night, when the dawn appears, it seems to the soul of the faithful one as if it were brought amid plants and scents . . ." [and so it goes to judgment].[1]

This passage in its context, which ought to be read for its great beauty, has been borrowed by other Parsi texts. It occurs, with slight change, in the so-called Vîshtâshp Yasht (Westergaard's Yasht 24), and, with greater changes, in the Ardâ Vîrâf Nâmak, and in the Dînâ-î Maînôg-î Khiradh (or Mînôkhirad).[2]

[1] The fragment printed by Westergaard as Yasht 22 is really not a Yasht, or prayer of praise, at all. According to ancient Parsi tradition (not, however, supported by the Dinkard), it is a part of the Hâdhôkht Nask, one of the twenty-one ancient divisions of the entire sacred literature of the Parsis. A French translation, with excellent notes, is given in the very valuable work of Nathan Söderblom, *La Vie Future d'après le Mazdéisme*, Paris, 1901, p. 82. The translation above is that of Darmesteter, *S. B. E.*, vol. xxiii., pp. 311 f.

[2] For the passage in the Vîshtâshp Yasht, *cf. S. B. E.*, xxiii., p. 342; for that in the Mînôkhirad, *S. B. E.*, xxiv., pp. 16–26 (translation by E. W. West). Also the Book of Ardâ Vîrâf, ed. Hôshangji and Haug, iv: 9–11 and xvii: 6 f.

In the latter text occurs a passage analogous to those quoted from the Vendidad and the Coptic apocalypse. "When he who is wicked dies, his soul then rushes about for three days and nights in the vicinity of the head of that wicked one, and sobs thus: Whither do I go, and now what do I make as a refuge? And the sin and crime of every kind, that were committed by him in the worldly existence, he sees with his eyes in those three days and nights. The fourth day Vîzareh the demon comes and binds the soul of the wicked . . ."[1]

The same conception is found in the curious gnostic work *Pistis Sophia*, dating perhaps from the second century. In that part which bears the title "Books of the Saviour" we read that the souls of the departed are led around in the world for three days of instruction before they leave earth for their place of punishment or reward.[2]

This whole subject of the three-day lingering of the soul after death needs more complete and critical investigation than it has yet received. It is clear that the notion prevailed among the Jews as among the Persians, and there is no reason for questioning the familiarity of Jesus and his disciples with it. The third day is therefore the natural point at which to set a resurrection thought of as following close upon death, and the confirmation of Scripture would make this date inevitable.[3]

[1] *S. B. E.*, xxiv., p. 22.

[2] *Cf.* G. R. S. Mead, *Pistis Sophia*, 1896, pp. 383–391.

[3] *Cf.* Bousset, p. 342, note. The student should consult (critically) the rabbinical, Avestan and apocryphal sources cited there and in the other references given in the note *supra*, p. 19.

There is another somewhat related theory as to the origin of the third day as the date of the resurrection. It is that offered by the scholars who are applying to Christian origins the "religionsgeschichtliche Methode," the method which seeks to understand religious phenomena in their origin and significance by a comparative study of similar phenomena in other, preferably older, religious movements. This method of study assumes in general a series of primitive fundamental religious conceptions, arising for the most part out of interpretations of natural phenomena. These conceptions appear and reappear, over and over, in endless combinations, with endless changes and developments, in the various religions, handed on from one to the other, borrowed and lent both consciously and unconsciously, ever invested with new meanings and associations, their ultimate origin lost

---

It seems doubtful whether the familiar apocalyptic 3½ days, adduced by Bousset and Böklen, have immediate bearing here (but *cf. infra*), or the "punishment of the 3 nights," of the Bundahish (*S. B. E.*, vol. v., p. 125), adduced by Böklen. So the "day or two" of mourning for the dead, in Ecclus. xxxviii: 17, has no significance here. In apocryphal Christian sources the 3-day period between death and burial or the final departure of the soul to its long home is not infrequently found. The measure of dependence on the gospel story is not in each case easily determinable. For the close parallel in "The Rest of the Words of Baruch," *cf. infra*, p. 31. It is cited in this connection by Böklen (p. 28), who calls attention also to the (second century? so James, p. 29) Testament of Abraham (ed. by M. R. James in *Texts and Studies*, vol. ii.), Recension A, ch. 20, where we read (James, p. 103) that after Abraham's death ἐκήδευσαν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ δικαίου Ἀβραὰμ ἕως τρίτης ἡμέρας τῆς τελειώσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτόν. "This," says James (pp. 126 f.), "agrees strikingly with a spurious Homily or Apocalypse of S.

and forgotten. To understand any one of the religious conceptions that go to make up the structure of our common Christianity, for example, we must trace, so far as we can, its devious way through the ethnic faiths that have transmitted it to us, until we run it to earth in the naïve speculations of primitive man.

There can be no question as to the correctness and the value of this method. It has scored brilliant successes in clearing up the origins of sacrifice and of the Christian sacraments, and it has shed the first real light that has ever fallen on the obscure magnificence of the apocalypses. No one can now believe, in an age whose thought is dominated by the concept of evolution, that any religious notion was, on a certain day, born ready-made in the mind of one or another prophet, like Melchizedek, without father or mother, or that the "revelation" of any truth from

---

Macarius (Galland, *Bibl. Patr.*, iii., 237)," in which after the saint's death *τὰς γὰρ δύο ἡμέρας συγχωρεῖται τῇ ψυχῇ . . . πορεύεσθαι ἔνθα βούλεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Then, on the third day, the soul goes with the angels up to heaven. James compares further (p. 34) the statement in the Pseudo-Johannine "Assumption of the Virgin" (Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphæ*, 1866, pp. 95 ff.), ch. 48, that hymns were sung at Mary's tomb for three days, till her body was transferred to Paradise. Böklen further cites the (Jewish–Christian? 2d or 3d century? James, xciii. f.) Testament of Job (ed. by M. R. James, *Texts and Studies*, vol. v., 1897), ch. 53, *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐνέθεντο αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν τάφον*. Finally Böklen notes Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, vii.: 17, 3, where a prophet, who is slain and unburied, comes to life on the third day and is caught up to heaven, a plain imitation of Rev. xi: 3–12, and Commodian, *Carmen Apologeticum*, 861 f.:

> "Illos autem Dominus quarto die tollit in auras
> Quos illi vetuerant sepultra jacentes."

God came on a sudden to a world previously without any of its constituent elements. The religio-historical method is scientific and illuminating; if in these earlier years of its wider use it sometimes goes too far and assumes to explain phenomena whose origins really lie outside its field, we cannot wonder. Time will correct such errors.[1]

Exponents of this method, notably Hermann Gunkel, have found by its use an explanation of the third day as the date of Jesus' resurrection. The divinity who dies and rises again is a figure familiar in the mythologies of most ancient nations, Egypt, Babylon, Phœnicia, Syria, Greece, Rome, and the roots of the conception seem to lie in a sun-myth. The sun is the great god of the primitive man; darkness and the cold and death of winter are the chief demons or anti-divine powers. Each evening darkness conquers and slays the sun, but each dawn the god breaks victoriously alive again from his tomb. Each autumn the winter-monster prevails; three months the sun is faint and spent, shorn of his power. With the fourth month he regains his strength and begins anew a glorious career. In all lands and times the solstices and the equinoxes have been the centres of celebration; Christmas and Easter are ancient festivals baptised into the Christian church and given a new name.

The time of the sun's exile, three or three and a half months, is a perpetually recurring number in

[1] The true use of this method must not be confused with the vagaries offered by Arthur Drews (*Die Christus-Mythe*, 1909; *Die Petrus Legende*, 1910) or Peter Jensen (*Das Gilgamesh-Epos in der Welt-Literatur*, 1906, vol. i.; *Moses Jesus Paulus*, 1910).

the mythologies and apocalypses of the ages.[1] Very frequently it becomes three days in which some god lies dead, to be greeted alive by his joyful worshippers on the fourth day. Is not all this so like the account of the rising of Jesus with the sunrise of the third day as to be actually the source of that conception? Is not the resurrection, with its date, simply a bit of

[1] So also is the moon, especially in spring, said to be three days invisible before the new moon begins. *Cf.* H. Zimmern in Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3d ed., 1903, pp. 362, 366, 388 f.

It is not yet quite clear what relation exists between this astronomical 3-day or 3-month period and the period of woe according to the apocalypses, which is expressed by some form of 3½. So Dan. vii: 25, xii: 7; Rev. xii: 14, "a time, times and half a time"; Dan. ix: 27, "half a week"; Rev. vi: 2, xiii: 5, "forty-two months"; Rev. xi: 3, xii: 6, "a thousand two hundred and sixty days" (Dan. viii: 14, xii: 11 f., seem to give three approximate reckonings of this same period, *cf.* Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1895, p. 269, note); Rev. xi: 9–11, "three and a half days." Josephus (*Bel. Jud.*, i., 1, 1; v., 9, 4) agrees with Daniel in fixing the interruption of the sacrifices under Antiochus Epiphanes at three years six months. "According to the Midrash on La. i: 5, the siege by Vespasian continued the same period" (*Dict. Christ and the Gospels*, vol. ii., 1908, p. 249, col. 1. On this *cf.* Clem. Alex., *Stromata*, i., 21, and Wetstein *ad* Rev. xi: 2).

So the great drought in the time of Elijah lasts three years and six months (Luke iv: 25; Jas. v: 17), and this, according to Rev. xi: 6, is "during the days of the prophecy" of the two witnesses Elijah and Moses (or Enoch?), which lasts (xi: 3) a thousand two hundred and sixty days. I. Kings xviii: 1 makes the drought end "in the third year." This three and a half seems, *pace* Gunkel (p. 266 f.), the broken half of the sacred seven, the symbol of perfection. Yet the sacredness of seven has astral origins. *Cf.* Gunkel: *loc. cit.*, pp. 266–270. Paul Carus, in *The Monist*, vol. xvi. (1906), pp. 415–421, urges, without proofs, that the "third day" of the resurrection is equivalent to the apocalyptic

this universal mythology transplanted into the soil of primitive Christian tradition?[1]

The inference seems clear, yet if examined more closely, it will be seen not to be quite what Professor Gunkel takes it to be. The comparative study of mythologies does not at all explain why the first Christians believed that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day; that they believed on the assurance of Jesus himself and of the Scriptures. It *does* explain, very probably, the origin of the Old Testament passages from which Jesus, quite unconscious of their primitive significance, drew his assurance.

Let the Jonah-story, for example, be explained by all means as the descendant of a sun-myth;[2] its conception and its phraseology are suggestive for Jesus quite independently of any such associations.

---

three and a half, which in turn is only the geometrical π (3.1459 +), the ratio of a circle's diameter to its circumference. In a system using mathematical formulas at all, we can hardly expect the equation $3.5 = 3.1459+$. More plausible is Maurenbrecher, pp. 102–104.

[1] For the argument *cf.* H. Gunkel: *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des N. T.*, 1903, pp. 76–83, and the references in his notes, especially those to Zimmern. The material is well presented in M. Brückner, "Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland in den Orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhältniss zum Christentum," 1908, a very valuable addition to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, and in Maurenbrecher, pp. 61–115. T. K. Cheyne, *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution*, 1904, pp. 110–128, presents some of the parallels in ethnic mythologies and argues the derivation from them of the beliefs concerning Jesus' resurrection. His position is well criticised by G. Margoliouth, in the *Contemporary Review*, vol. lxxxviii. (Nov. 1905), pp. 717 ff.

[2] Gunkel: *loc. cit.*, p. 80; Hans Schmidt, *Jona*, 1907.

The religious certainty which they confirm for him is the original act of his inner life, and wholly unrelated to any mythology. Smite the whole ramification of sun-myths from human history, and this certainty would for Jesus have been the same, though his people's sacred books might not have furnished him just the same phraseology in which to clothe it.

Any or all of the passages suggested below as those in which Jesus and Paul found confirmation of their faith may have their roots in mythologic concepts. Their history before they became a part of the Hebrew sacred text is a matter for investigation elsewhere, but not in our immediate connection. The only point in which popular mythology is *directly* concerned with the date of the resurrection is in the influence upon Jesus' thought of the Persian–Jewish idea of the three-day lingering of the soul after death. This idea we may well consider a part of that mythologic complex, and its roots may possibly be found to be intertwined with those of the dead sun-god conception. But here too this conception is not the origin of the thought in Jesus' mind, so that without it he might have expected his resurrection a week, a month, or a year after death. Of the immediacy of the event, of the real point to be proved, he was already antecedently certain, with a certainty that could have dispensed with all external attestation. In short, all that the *religionsgeschichtliche*[1] material could do for him was to insure the presence in the Old Testament of certain passages which lent themselves to his

[1] I regret that we have not an exact English equivalent for this useful word.

faith, and to suggest the interpretation of such passages as references to resurrection from death.

All that is here contended is that to no element of popular mythology is due the *origin* of the belief that Jesus rose on the third day. The belief once held, the fact that it fitted in with certain popular concepts was of course of immense significance, and had large influence in the spreading and domestication of the belief among the peoples.[1] The connection with current mythological conceptions was also largely influential in the development and modification of the belief concerning the third day, in the symbolisms and meanings which clustered about it, and especially in the institutions to which it gave rise, notably the celebration of Sunday (significant name) and of Easter. The date of Jesus' death chanced to be such as to afford the widest scope for these myth-making influences. The very day of the week, Friday, which is historically certain, causes the feast of resurrection to coincide with the day when the sun is celebrated and the new week begins.[2] Scarcely less suggestive is the approximate synchronism of the Easter-feast with the vernal equinox. But these are coincidences.

It is worthy of observation in this connection that modern scholars are not the first to see the analogies between the resurrection and certain astral phenomena.

[1] On this whole point *cf.* Lake, pp. 260–264, Arnold Meyer, p. 184, with the notes. Meyer's whole discussion of the three days (pp. 178–185, with the notes) is very valuable.

[2] Bacon, *Founding of the Church*, 1909, p. 76, denies the connection of the Sunday-observance with the third day, and finds its origin in the Pentecost-episode. This is clearly erroneous.

The church fathers very frequently note them. Theophilus of Antioch, for example, in the last quarter of the second century, writes, "Consider, if you please, the dying of seasons and days and nights, how all these die and rise again. . . . Consider the resurrection of the moon, which occurs monthly; how it wanes, dies, and rises again."[1]

In the illustrative passages cited from ethnic sources the period of death is for the most part three days (or months), so that the revival comes really on the fourth day; whereas Jesus' resurrection is on the third day, not after three days. There is possibly a trace of the influence of the mythological conception in the phrase used by Mark in Jesus' predictions (viii: 31, ix: 31, x: 34), "after three days," yet Mark puts the resurrection itself on the third day, Sunday. In fact the two phrases seem to be used indifferently by the gospel writers, as equivalent in meaning.[2] Luke (ix: 22, xviii: 33, xxiv: 7, 46; Acts x: 40) has everywhere "on the third day." So has Matthew (xvi: 21, xvii: 23, xx: 19) except in xxvii: 63, yet in xii: 40 he declares that "the Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," a literal contradiction of the date in xxviii: 1. Significant for Matthew's usage is further xxvii: 64 compared with the preceding verse. The Sanhedrists remember that Jesus said: "*After three days* I rise again," and therefore wish "the sepulchre to be made sure *until the third day*."

The allusions to the destruction of the temple and

[1] *Ad Autolychum*, i: 13. Trans. by Marcus Dods in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American Ed., vol. ii., 1885, p. 93.

[2] *Cf.* Schwartzkopff, p. 69; Bauer, p. 254.

its speedy rebuilding (Mark xiv: 58, xv: 29; Mat. xxvi: 61, xxvii: 40; John ii: 19 f.), which John (and possibly the other evangelists?) thought of as an allusion to Jesus' resurrection, have uniformly "in three days," which therefore is again equivalent to "on the third day." Mark's phrase "after three days" is more *religionsgeschichtlich;* "on the third day" is probably more true to Jesus' own wording, as evidenced by Hosea vi: 2. It is clear that to the minds of the earliest Christians "on the third day" and "after three days" could be used as referring to the same point of time and fitted in equally well with their mythological traditions and folklore.

Significant here is a passage in the ninth chapter of the second-century apocalyptic "Rest of the Words of Baruch,"[1] which pictures the death and resurrection of Jeremiah, the author (at least of this passage) being a Christian who is imitating the gospel story. "And after this they made themselves ready that they should bury him. And behold there came a voice saying: Bury not him that is yet alive, because his soul enters into his body again. And hearing the voice, they buried him not, but remained about his tabernacle [*i.e.*, body, σκήνωμα as in II. Pet. i: 13 f.] three days speaking and unknowing in what hour he is to rise. And after three days his soul entered into his body." This date is meant by the author as perfectly equivalent to the third day of Jesus' resurrection.

So much for the origins of the third day as an element of the primitive tradition. We may now

[1] Ed. by J. Rendel Harris, 1889, pp. 62 f. The book is probably a Christian recension of a document originally Jewish.

at length put the question: What passages of Scripture were relied upon, first by Jesus, then in turn by Paul, as confirmation of their faith? In no authentic words of either have we any definite quotation as to "the third day," but the Scriptures they and their followers read are open to us, and the passages in question ought not to be difficult to find. We know that for Jesus the passage in Dan. vii: 13 ff. gave the form for his Messianic appearing, consequent on his resurrection. We know from Acts ii: 25 ff. that early Christians quoted Psalm xvi: 8 ff. as showing that the resurrection of Jesus was to follow closely upon his death; his soul was not to be *left* in Hades, but to rise before corruption set in upon the body.[1] Of course the author of Acts thought of this with reference to a rising of Jesus' body before decay began, but Jesus may have relied upon it without any such connotation, reading the passage so: My soul shall not be left in Sheol; before it can see the beginning of decay in its old tenement, it shall be brought to a new one. We do not *know* that he relied upon this passage, or that Paul did, but both may well have done so.

More definite is the second chapter of Jonah. To be sure, Jesus nowhere quotes this of his resurrection,

[1] It is no doubt true (so, *e.g.*, Robertson Smith, in the *Expositor*, 1st series, vol. iv. [1878], pp. 353 f. and Schmiedel, col. 4083*c*) that the LXX. and other versions are inaccurate, that the original should be rendered, "For thou wilt not give up my soul to Sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thy beloved to see the pit." *I.e.*, the Psalmist is confident, not that he will escape from the underworld, but that he will not die. But this has no bearing here, since Acts ii: 25 ff. shows how the verse was understood by the early Christians. Why not also so by Jesus?

but Luke xi: 29–32 shows him familiar with the book of Jonah, and thinking of the experiences of Jonah as having analogies to his own. The first evangelist, however (Mat. xii: 40), thinks of Jonah ii: 1 f. as one of the Scripture prophecies of the third-day resurrection, and mistakenly (as Luke and the whole context make clear), puts it into the mouth of Jesus. Though Jesus does not here mean what Matthew means by "the sign of Jonah," he may yet have thought of the passage, as Matthew does, as prophetic of his resurrection, and, on another occasion, so used it.[1]

But a more certain word is not wanting, clear and confident. It is Hosea vi: 2, "After two days will he revive us; on the third day he will raise us up and we shall live before him." Surely if Jesus found the third day anywhere in the Old Testament, he found it here. It is probable that this passage was already interpreted by the rabbis of his time as a reference to the resurrection of the righteous dead in the Messianic age. The first two verses of the chapter are rendered by the Targum Jonathan (accessible in Brian Walton's Polyglott, vol. iii.) as follows: "They shall say: come and let us return to the worship of the Lord, for he who smote us will also heal us, and he who brought upon us destruction, will revive us. He will give us life in the days of consolation which are to come, in the day of the resurrection of the dead he will resuscitate us, and we shall live before him."[2]

[1] Such suggestion would help to account for Matthew's use of the quotation here. He would be following his not infrequent practice of combining two originally separate *logia*. This is, of course, only a possibility, and no stress is to be laid on it.

[2] *Cf.* Brandt, p. 429, note.

This targum, though it took its present shape perhaps not earlier than the fifth century A.D., embodies old interpretations, many of which were doubtless current in Jesus' time. The reference of the text to the resurrection is a natural one; it *need* not have first been made by Jesus.

Scarcely less striking and definite, when read with an eye open to every possible Messianic application, are the words of II. Kings xx: 5. "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; behold, I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord."

These two or three passages are more than ample to give Jesus Scriptural certification of the third day. Perhaps he, quite certainly his followers, found suggestions to the same intent in many other passages, such as Isaiah liv: 7 f.; Psalms lxxi: 20, lxxxvi: 13, cxviii: 17 f. and Psalm cx: 1 f., quoted by Jesus as Messianic in Mark xii: 36.[1]

When all is said and done, the third day, though a fixed element in the earliest tradition, is a point of secondary import. Paul alludes to it only the once, as Scripturally attested; it is, in short, only the date of an event, to which event, not to its date, attaches real significance. And it is the date merely of the resurrection, *not of anything else.* Beyschlag is

[1] Of other O. T. passages used as prophetic of the resurrection, though without bearing upon the date, Job xix: 25–27 and Ps. ii: 7 should be noted. It is interesting to see how in Acts xiii: 33 the latter passage is referred to the resurrection, as the point at which Jesus was exalted to Messianic rank, whereas in Luke iii: 22 (according to the probable reading) it is referred to the baptism—a clear indication of the way in which the Messiahship was pushed back to cover the earthly life.

wholly without reason when he claims[1] that Paul intends to date the appearance of Jesus to Cephas and the Twelve on the third day, because Jesus could not be thought of as risen without at once seeking his disciples; in short, that Paul "places the resurrection and therewith at the same time the first appearances of the risen one, on the 'third day.'"[2]

As a matter of fact, absolutely nothing can be deduced, from Paul's statement, as to the date of the first phenomena which attested to Jesus' followers that he was risen. "He appeared to Cephas"—but when? and where? For anything in Paul's words it might have been weeks, months, or years after the "third day," and the place any place open to Peter's wandering feet. So far as Paul's testimony goes, then, the date of the resurrection is not known empirically, but is a matter of faith; but still further, the act of resurrection itself, the rising, is not known empirically. Paul knows Jesus is risen *simply because he has appeared*, and all Paul's testimony here is to these appearances, not at all to the act of resurrection. That he passes over with a word, as lying outside the sensible world, known only as a necessary deduction from the "appearances." There is no real testimony to the actual rising of Jesus in any letter of Paul; there is only testimony to the experiences of those to whom his rising was thus certified.

And this marks a profound difference between the apostolic testimony in the epistles and the later statements of the gospels. The great central fact of Paul's consciousness is that Jesus is now alive. Not:

[1] Beyschlag, p. 438. [2] *Loc. cit.*, p. 447.

he rose, but: *he lives*. The rising, as such, is entirely secondary, a corollary merely to the one great, kindling, all-embracing fact of the present life of Jesus. The whole thing is apprehended subjectively, from the point of view of the experience of the disciple and the believer. The gospels, on the other hand, present it all objectively, from the point of view of what Jesus did, how he rose and what were his subsequent movements.

So when a prisoner of war has broken his bonds and escaped; the first overmastering thought and feeling of the wife and children who clasp him again to their hearts is, he is free, he is with us, in warm, tender, actual presence! The detailed consideration that he laboriously tunnelled the wall, and wrested away the bars of iron, and let himself down with a rope, and outran the pursuing guards, comes only later. This may serve to illustrate the difference between the consciousness of the Christians in the first decades after Jesus' death and that of the calmer, more reflective church of the last years of the century.

At the cost of repetition, let it be said again that the earliest Christians, with Paul, had their minds and hearts filled with the ecstatic conviction: Jesus lives, our present friend and inspirer, and had no testimony whatever to bear to the activity of Jesus in rising from the dead, witnessing only to their own experiences of communion with him in vision or revelation. The later church lost this earliest spiritual ecstatic enthusiasm; the glow died away, the "appearances" ceased, the "spirit" was withdrawn, and the Christian writers could testify only to the external facts as to Jesus' body leaving the tomb and its subsequent movements. The difference is wide as heaven.

It cannot be sufficiently emphasised that Paul and the gospels witness to two entirely different things; the former to experiences and convictions of the disciples, the latter to *post-mortem* acts of Jesus. Nowhere is this fact more clearly in evidence than in the circumstance that the grave, which is so prominent a feature in the gospel narrative, never appears in the apostolic witness. Indeed, it can scarcely be maintained that the burial of Jesus had any special interest or significance for Paul.[1] Aside from I. Cor. xv: 4, there is only the faintest further allusion to it, namely, in Rom. vi: 4 (repeated in Col. ii: 12). But the latter reference is due solely to the symbolic value of the burial for the figure Paul was developing; otherwise it would not have been mentioned.

And here, too, precisely as in I. Cor. xv: 4, the statement of Jesus' burial is only an emphatic statement of his death. It is very noticeable that the two experiences of Jesus which have analogues in the Christian's religious experience are his *death* and resurrection, not his *burial* and resurrection. "We

[1] Keim, p. 526 (Eng. tr., p. 272), curiously asserts that Paul "repeatedly speaks of the burial of Jesus," yet in a note on p. 533 (Eng. tr., p. 281) gives the only passages as I. Cor. xv: 4 and Rom. vi: 4. The latter reference is a trifle strained, but may pass. Similarly Riggenbach, p. 19, remarks that Paul "*wiederholt*" speaks of baptism as being buried and raised with Christ, but can cite only Rom. vi: 3 f. and Col. ii: 12. The latter passage is in very literalness a "Wiederholung" of the former.

There is in Paul all but an entire lack of words referring to sepulture. *Θάπτω* only I. Cor. xv: 4; *συνθάπτω* Rom. vi: 4 and its quotation in Col. ii: 12; *τάφος* only in Rom. iii: 13 in a quotation from the 5th Psalm; *μνημεῖον* and cognates not at all; *τύμβος* not at all.

who *died*" (vs. 2), "we were baptised into his *death*" (vs. 3, where we might have expected "into his *burial*"), "we were buried into *death*" (vs. 4), "united with the likeness of his *death*" (vs. 5). In vs. 4 the comparison is "like as Christ was raised *from the dead*," not "from the grave." And so throughout the whole passage (Rom. vi: 2–11) every verse contains the term "death," or its equivalent in noun or verb form ("crucified" in vs. 6), the contrast being clearly and exclusively between death and the new life. Even in vs. 13 it is "as alive from the dead," as living out from among those who are dead (ζῶντας ἐκ νεκρῶν). In short, the burial as such can scarcely be said to appear here; it forms absolutely no moment in the apostle's argument. The term "buried into death" is used instead of the equivalent "died" simply because among the processes or elements connected with the "death" of a human being, burial rather than the simple expiration forms the suitable analogue to baptism. The exclusive subject of the apostle's thought is Jesus' death and his resurrection "from the dead."

This is true not only of this passage in Romans, but everywhere in Paul; for him, Jesus is always risen "from the dead." The Greek phrase is ἐκ νεκρῶν, literally "out from among the company of those who are dead."[1] That "the dead" in this familiar phrase is invariably a masculine plural is somewhat

[1] ἐκ νεκρῶν is not only Paul's usual phrase, but the common phrase of the N. T. writers. It is worth while in this connection to run through νεκρός in Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament (2d ed., 1900), as well as through the verbs ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι, with their cognates. A concordance is often the most illuminating of commentaries.

obscured to the average reader by our English translation; at least if we rendered "risen from among departed spirits" we should have in the popular mind an impression at once somewhat different from that which at present prevails and more true to the apostle's meaning. For him, the resurrection is *always* from among the souls of the dead, *never* from the grave; that which rises is, consequently, that which goes to the place of departed souls, namely, the soul of Jesus, not his body. The place out of which there was resurrection gives the definition at once of that which rose and of the place into which it rose. Paul's wording places the whole transaction in the supersensible world; a spirit rises from a place of spirits into a place of spirits.

Professor Stevens thus clearly puts the necessary implication of the phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται. "Resurrection is neither resurrection of the body, nor resurrection from the ground in which the body is buried, but is a rising of the personality from the realm of death into the realm of light and life, whereupon the spirit is clothed with its heavenly habitation."[1] There is absolutely no hint anywhere in Paul that the spirit, coming from among the dead, entered again into the cast-off body and re-animated it; rather is this idea strictly excluded by all that Paul urges. The thing that I. Cor. xv says most plainly and insistently is that the resurrection of which Paul preaches has no relation whatever to the dead body and the grave. In fact, the whole discussion of the chapter is directed against certain in Corinth who have made

[1] George B. Stevens, *Theology of the New Testament*, 1899, p. 477.

just this mistake—which the Christian world has made ever since—of understanding resurrection to mean a rising in some way of the body that was put into the grave. The thing which Paul is here combating is *the beginning of the conception which the gospel stories present.*[1] When Paul is read with the gospel stories entirely ignored, it becomes absolutely certain that in his thought there was no empty grave, no revived body, and that I. Cor. xv is the most forcible argument ever brought against the narrative of the gospels.

Paul knows a present Jesus, living the heavenly life in the spiritual body above; to him and to others have come appearances of this glorified Friend, moments of sweet and beautiful revelation of his presence, and these revelations necessitate that Jesus had not been held of death, but had risen from among the dead, to be alive forevermore; the time of this rising from death into life the prophets' word had fixed as the third day. This, in brief, is the thought of Paul and the earliest Christians concerning the resurrection.

[1] W. R. Greg, *The Creed of Christendom*, 5th ed., 1877, Introduction, p. xxviii., keenly remarks that if we had *only* the testimony of Paul, "our grounds for accepting the resurrection as a historical fact in its naked simplicity would be far stronger than they actually are." It is the gospel stories which introduce the doubts. Paul's statement is consistent and intelligible, but "we cannot frame any theory whatever as to the resurrection which is not distinctly negatived by one or other of the evangelical accounts." (*Ibid.*, p. xxix.)

So Brandt, p. 440, concludes that any understanding of the origin of the disciples' faith in Jesus' resurrection must be based on Paul's witness, not on the stories given by Matthew, Luke, or John.

CHAPTER II

HE APPEARED

"SO we preached and so ye believed." Prominent in this *kerygma* was the declaration: he appeared to Cephas. "He appeared" (ὤφθη)—surely that is not the word which either a Greek or an Englishman would normally use of one man in the body meeting another man in the body. We never read that Jesus "appeared" to any one before his death. Keim says, "It is the same expression which Paul and the New Testament generally use for visions which have nothing else in common with the resurrection appearances of Jesus,"[1] to which Dr. Milligan strongly objects.[2] But though the form of Keim's statement is perhaps not wholly accurate, yet the thing he means to say is true, that ὤφθη is used in the New Testament for "appearances" of super-earthly beings, either of God or of the glorified Christ, and that these "appearances," whether or not the word is used, are what we usually call "visions."[3] The only exception seems to be Acts vii: 26, where the word is used of the sudden and unexpected appearance of Moses before two

[1] Keim, p. 540 (Eng. tr., p. 289).

[2] Milligan, p. 265, note 38.

[3] *Cf.* Karl G. Bretschneider, *Lexicon in Libros N. T.*, 2d ed., 1829, vol. ii., p. 165.

quarrelling Israelites. Here the author plainly means to suggest something unusual and mysterious, divinely appointed, in this appearance of Moses. The preceding verse indicates that he is here the medium of a divine power, and so bears something of the supernatural about him, which his brethren ought to recognise, though they fail to do so. A little later (vs. 30) an angel "appears" to Moses, precisely as he "appeared" to his quarrelling brethren. His slaying of the Egyptian is justified by his divine commission, and the impulse to visit his brethren that "came into his heart" came there by the interposition of God. Only this explains the sudden transformation of Moses the wise and mighty prince at the Egyptian court into Moses the defender and leader of the Hebrew slaves. Further, the phraseology of the whole chapter is influenced by the conception of Moses as the prototype of Jesus the Messiah. ὤφθη has therefore here too something of its usual significance. At any rate, aside from this single case, the word, as Schmiedel points out, "always stands for another kind of seeing than that of ordinary sense-perception."[1]

The men of the first century were of course as capable as we are of distinguishing between normal seeing with the eye and this seeing in vision, this beholding of supernatural objects in ecstasy, trance, or dream. But of course they attributed reality to what they "saw" in the one case as in the other. So that nothing is gained by Beyschlag's insistence that the faith of Paul and the disciples that Jesus

[1] Schmiedel, col. 4079. *Cf.* Thayer's Lexicon *ad* ὁράω and Holsten, pp. 36 f., 68 f. The LXX. uses ὤφθησαν in the more general sense I. Kings iii: 16, but *cf.* Is. xl: 5.

was really risen could not have been based on "visions" of his glorified form.[1] This author really argues that these men, when speaking of visions, were convinced of the "Nichtrealität" of what they seemed to see, that they regarded the vision as a sort of divinely-worked optical illusion, "a telegram from heaven," in Keim's oft-quoted phrase, a "picture" through which God wished to say something to them. They did not think that there was really anything there when the angel-form hovered before their dreaming eyes, but only that God in this wise was impressing his message on their minds.

So Beyschlag, but surely quite contrariwise Paul, Mark, Matthew, or Luke. They were perfectly sure that something was there, a reality, only of a somewhat different sort from those realities apprehended by normal waking sight, a reality of the super-earthly world. Such realities were conceived as material, no doubt, in some exceedingly attenuated and refined fashion[2]—the concept of pure spirit, without any substantial embodiment, was probably impossible then, as it is for most people to-day[3]—but they were consciously apprehended with no necessary use of the outer eye and ear. The case made most use of by Beyschlag, that of Peter's release by the angel (Acts xii), clearly does not at all support his contention.

[1] Beyschlag, pp. 461–470.

[2] This reservation must be kept in mind throughout the following discussion.

[3] F. D. Maurice, *Theological Essays*, American Ed. (from the 2d English), 1854, p. 136, well says, "People *talk* of their friends as disembodied. When they *think* of them, they are obliged to suppose them clothed with bodies."

Peter "wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision." Beyschlag fails to say what this means, on the basis of his view of what Peter (or "Luke") meant by vision. Did Peter suppose that "what was done by the angel" was but a "Nichtrealität," a picture? Then where is his freeing? No, he is convinced that the process is a reality; that he stands at liberty in the open is sufficient proof of that. He only doubts whether it took place in normal material fashion,—as it would, for example, had the jailer come with his keys and released him,—he being awake, seeing with his eyes the angel's doings, hearing with his ears the angel's words, or whether he was still asleep (vs. 6) and all had happened to him in an ecstasy, his bodily senses inactive until he suddenly "comes to himself" (vs. 11) in the dark and silent street.

And so nowhere does "vision" mean for the writers or characters of the New Testament unreality or pictorial appearance. Nor does it properly have this meaning in our modern speech. Dr. Milligan writes as if "vision" connoted "hallucination," an error shared by many writers on the resurrection. Most of the polemic against the "vision-hypothesis" is due to this mistaken connotation. Even Keim's suggestion of a vision wrought by direct divine intervention, the "telegram from heaven"[1] very justly does not escape this polemic, for this vision too is but a providential hallucination. Jesus was not really there at all, but far off in heaven, as the sender of the telegram is not in the office where the message

[1] Keim, pp. 602–606 (Eng. tr., pp. 360–365).

is received and written down, but in the distant city, so that we do not even get his handwriting or come into any direct touch with him at all. We get the message that he wished to send, but we do not get himself.

Now this connotation of the word "vision" is unjust. A vision is simply a phenomenon of sight, and does not in the least imply necessary unreality or illusion. Material corporeality is usually excluded by the word, but a vision may be as real as a reflection in a mirror or, indeed, as a corporeal figure. Let us say a figure holding a basket of fruit appears before us. At first it meets but the sight; hearing, smell, taste, touch, do not apprehend it. Then it moves, it shapes words with its lips. If these phenomena still continue to be phenomena of sight *merely*, if no sound comes, if the figure is not tangible to our grasp, if no fragrance is borne to our nostrils from the fruit, and our attempt to taste it is like biting empty air—then the appearance is properly a "vision," a phenomenon of sight only. But this decides nothing as to the figure's reality; only further and different tests can do that. A clever arrangement of mirrors, for example, might project such an image into any given space, which would be as truly *there*, as little a subjective hallucination of the spectator, as the near-by table. Other things being equal, of course, a phenomenon apprehensible by only one sense is more likely to be proven by further tests to be a hallucination than one responding to three, four, or five. One responding to five senses rarely demands a test, but is assumed in general to be actual. Yet even here derangement can produce hallucination, and actuality needs to be

tested by the consenting senses of others. In cases where but one sense attests a phenomenon, there is always need of further testing; but each case must be tested on its own merits, and no phenomenon ought hastily to be denied actuality because it is a "vision."[1]

Beyschlag begs the whole question when he substitutes for "actuality" in this connection the word "Leibhaftigkeit," *i.e.*, the actuality of a material body. He would urge that there is hallucination unless what is actually present is what the seer believes to be present, namely, in the present instance, the physical body of Jesus. But this is precisely the point at issue; the assertion that the disciples believed a material body to be before them cannot be offered as a proof that they so believed, which is what we are questioning.

As a matter of fact, what the disciples believed themselves to see was *Jesus himself*, in actual presence; it is quite arbitrary to say that this for them necessarily meant his physical form, *i.e.*, himself as responding to all their senses. Indeed, taking at their face value the synoptic accounts, the constant element is the real Jesus, who renders himself at one time visible, at another audible, at another tangible, at another all three, or any two, or becomes none of the three. He puts on and off at will the medium which makes him apprehensible by one or another sense; he is not *permanently* apprehensible by any, yet *he*,

[1] Dr. Milligan ought not to forget Acts xxvi: 19, where Paul calls his conversion-appearance a "heavenly vision," or Luke xxiv: 23, "a vision of angels which said that he was alive." On this whole matter of "visions" and their conditions, *cf.* the excellent treatment by Holsten, pp. 79–84.

in his actual risen self, is permanently present. This actual presence makes itself visible, assumes a condition by which it may be apprehended by Peter or Paul through one sense. It has nothing which can respond to any other sense. Then it may proceed to speak, *i.e.*, it assumes the medium of response to another sense. The *vision* does not speak, *Jesus* speaks; *i.e.*, he reveals himself through two channels to his disciple. If he wills, he may in the same fashion assume a third medium of response, and become tangible. One does not touch the *vision*, one touches *him*. Then he lays aside the tangibility; one still sees him and hears his voice. Then he is silent; the vision alone remains. Then that fades, but *he* persists, as real as before. Nothing whatever has happened to his actuality; he has only ceased to make himself apprehensible by the normal senses.

That is the general conception which lies behind the primitive accounts of the appearances of Jesus. Of course it was not thought out in any such connected fashion; we may not attribute psychological analysis to these first-century Hebrews, but it is the conception which governed their thought. They could perceive a phenomenon of sight, or a phenomenon of hearing, or a phenomenon of both, without denying actuality to that phenomenon because it failed to include a response to the third sense, that of touch.[1] The denial of this fact has vitiated Beyschlag's whole

[1] Of course in Mat. and Luke this conception is imperfectly adjusted to (or confused with) another, namely that the buried body was present. I speak here of Paul's testimony, and that of the earliest witnesses, who must have agreed with him; "so we preached."

discussion here; clear recognition of it is absolutely fundamental to our understanding of the earliest record.[1]

In that earliest record we have testimony to "visions," phenomena of sight, "appearances" of Jesus, alive and glorious, after he had died. That Paul clearly says, and represents the Twelve as saying. He nowhere indicates that there were any phenomena of tangibility, or that such were claimed by other recipients. It is a question whether there were in some cases phenomena of hearing as well, *i.e.*, spoken and understood words. In some of Paul's ecstatic experiences, there seem to have been appeals to hearing as well as to sight (II. Cor. xii: 4, perhaps also xii: 9), but this is not said to have been coincident with any appearance of the risen Jesus, and indeed Paul is uncertain whether on such an occasion impressions were conveyed to him through the bodily senses at all. His "revelations" (*e.g.*, Gal. ii: 2; II. Cor. xii: 7) perhaps imply audible phenomena, but there is no indication in his own words that justifies the report given in three-fold version by Acts (ix: 4–6, xxii: 7–10, xxvi: 14–18) of the conversation between Paul and Jesus "when it pleased God to reveal his son" to the persecutor before the gates of Damascus. Such a "revelation," as Schmiedel rightly points out,[2] could

[1] Schwartzkopff, in *The Monist*, vol. xi. (Oct. 1900), pp. 18 f., strongly urges the above point of view. *Cf.* Schmiedel's excellent treatment of the point, and his criticism of Beyschlag, cols. 4079 f., section 34, *d–e*.

[2] Col. 4063. Schmiedel persuasively argues against any audible phenomena in connection with the resurrection appearances. The gospel utterances of the risen Jesus will be discussed later.

hardly be passed over by Paul in his frequent defence of his apostolate (especially in I. Cor. ix: 1), and the whole Acts-narrative here is plainly legendary in its external detail. Without pronouncing an absolute negative, therefore, we may say that there is no clear indication in the primitive account of appeal to any sense but that of sight.

The latter appeal, however, is asserted with the greatest distinctness. What Paul does say is, "Have I not *seen* Jesus our Lord?" (I. Cor. ix: 1).[1] "He was *seen* of Cephas" and all the rest; absolutely no other verb is used by Paul of Jesus' post-resurrection manifestation save this repeated ὤφθη or ἑώρακα. So Luke (xxiv: 34) reproduces Paul's witness to the first manifestation, in the phrase ὤφθη Σίμωνι. So the earliest gospel tradition in Mark (xvi: 7) points the disciples to Galilee with the promise "there shall ye see him," ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. There is no promise that they shall converse with Jesus, or clasp his hand; only a sight of him is assured. It may of course be urged that ὄψεσθε does not exclude the possibility of more direct intercourse with Jesus; the fact remains that the verb which dominates the primitive tradition as to Jesus' post-resurrection manifestations is the verb *see*. The sense of sight at any rate received the revelation; it remains to be inquired whether the later witness of the gospels can establish the fact that appeal was made also to hearing and touch. If so, there is no indication of it in our earliest witness, which at once establishes a grave

[1] *Cf.* Holsten, p. 37. "Ebenso ist das perfect ἑώρακα der characteristische ausdruck da, wo von dem schauen eines ὅραμα und einer ὀπτασία die rede ist."

presumption against it, which only well-authenticated testimony can remove.[1]

As a matter of fact, the gospels witness to a development of thought which was no longer satisfied with the simple statement of those to whom Jesus had manifested himself; that no longer met the demand for evidential force in the narrative. Luke reproduces in two words the "appearance" to Peter, which on any theory must have been the most important of the earlier appearances, as it was the first, and spends not another word upon it. Yet he describes in great detail, in twenty-three verses, or nearly half his whole resurrection-report, the appearance to the two disciples on the Emmaus-road, which, so far as recorded, had no further result and is wholly unknown to all the other accounts. It was simply that the mere "seeing" of Jesus was no longer of interest, however eminent the seer; one craved a picturesque episode of conversations and activities of the risen Lord, of the resumption of his relations to the physical environment.[2] He was seen, he spoke, he exhibited hands and feet, flesh and bones, he broke bread, ate and drank with the disciples—these are the successive stages, logical and chronological, in the materialisation of the reported manifestations of the Risen One.

So far, therefore, we have testimony to "visions"

[1] *Cf.* also Acts xiii: 31, where what is said of the resurrection, (the preacher is Paul), is simply, "God raised him from the dead, and *he was seen* (ὤφθη) for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people." That sentence, save perhaps the phrase, "for many days," is just what the real Paul must often have said. It is a perfect compend of his thought on the matter.

[2] *Cf.* Schmiedel, col. 4069, sec. 23*e;* Brandt, pp. 416 f.

of Jesus after his death. No explanation of the disciples' experience has received more polemic treatment from apologetic writers than the "vision-hypothesis."[1] The animus of all objections to this hypothesis is of course the fact that, as commonly understood, it removes all actuality from the appearances. What actually existed was merely the visual impression on the disciples' sensorium; outside of this, nothing was there. There was no external reality expressing itself in this visual impression, whose origin, on the contrary, is wholly subjective, to be sought in the psychic processes of the seer. A reaction of the mind upon itself, then, not the action of the veritably present Jesus upon the mind, is the substance of the phenomenon according to the "vision-theory," as commonly urged and understood.

Advocated by Strauss and Renan, it found its classic expression in Holsten,[2] and is clearly set forth for the present-day reader in Schmiedel's *Biblica* article. One sentence from the closing passage of that article may make clear why this theory is so ardently opposed. "The error which it points out

[1] J. Kreyenbühl, in *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wiss.*, 1908, p. 275, says, "Die Visionshypothese ist der Bankerott der sogenannten liberalen Theologie."

[2] Carl Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Petrus und Paulus*, 1868. An excellent presentation of the hypothesis as argued by Renan, Noack, Ewald, Strauss, Lang, Hausrath, and Holsten, with criticism, is given by Steude, pp. 35–96.

Among more recent scholars, the hypothesis is adopted by Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, H. Holtzmann, Reville, Brandt, Wrede, Arnold Meyer, Völter. *Cf.* O. Schmiedel, pp. 78 f. Other good expressions of the same view are found in Clemen, pp. 197 ff. and *Supernatural Religion*, pp. 877–901.

affects merely the husk—namely, that the risen Jesus was seen in objective reality—not the kernel of the matter, that Jesus lives in the spiritual sense." It is the almost universal contention of those for whom these experiences have value that the objectively real presence of Jesus with certain of his followers after his death is not at all the husk of the matter, to be lightly shed without real loss to faith. They may be certain, on other more abstract grounds, as many of the pre-Christian Greeks and Hebrews were certain, of the immortality of the soul, that Jesus, in common with every one else who has died, "lives in the spiritual sense." But they contend that the heart of the experiences cited by Paul in I. Cor. xv: 1–8 is *something else* than this general truth, namely, the particular truth that Jesus, after his death, was objectively present with certain of his followers and manifested himself to one (or more) of their physical senses. They believe that Moses, Elijah, and John Baptist, with millions more, were "alive in the spiritual sense" in the year 30 A.D. just as truly as was Jesus, but that Jesus is here recorded as doing something which none of these others did, namely, as coming and showing himself to still living men. Any "vision-theory" which postulates that, in reality, Jesus' after-death existence differed in no way from that of these others, that he did nothing which they did not also do, naturally meets the vigorous denial of these believers. The unique action on the part of Jesus, which separates him from all the other dead, is therefore for them the very kernel of the matter, not its worthless husk. They cannot resolve the origin of the belief in this unique action into certain

entirely subjective processes which went on in the disordered brains of a number of people in Palestine. They point out that these very people already believed from childhood that Moses, Elijah, their own ancestors, were "alive in the spiritual sense," and would, of course, believe the same about Jesus; but that now, by certain vivid experiences, they were suddenly convinced of *something entirely different* about him. They needed no "vision" to prove to them the truth of immortality, nor did the "appearances" have for them this value.

It is clear that there is very great measure of justice in this contention. Professor Schmiedel does somewhat miss the point of what Paul was asserting, and what the opponents of the vision-theory assert to-day. They will not, cannot, think of Jesus as seated, with all the other dead, in some far-off heaven, either ignorant of the abnormal processes which are going on in the minds of Peter and Paul convincing them of his presence, or if knowing, taking absolutely no part in the production of these mental experiences (which are, just for that reason, hallucinations), powerless, indeed, to cause them, or to prevent them, or to correct them.

It was just here that Professor Keim made halt, and refused to go with the vision-hypothesis. It seemed too heartless, too brutal, as well as too far out of accord with what Christian faith must expect of its Master. Keim, with this *a priori* opposition to the theory of purely subjective visions, was able also to offer certain cogent historical and psychological arguments against it. Then by an act of Christian faith, which was of course quite independent of

psychology or historical research, he postulated a real participation of Jesus in the production of the mental experiences of the disciples which they called visions of him. Not, indeed, that Jesus actually came down and manifested his objective presence to the disciples, but that from heaven, by a sort of long-distance communication, he brought about the experience, and by it delivered his message. Hence Keim's term for what took place is the graphic one, "a telegram from heaven."[1]

We have already seen the weak point in this suggestion of Keim's faith, why it too receives a share of the polemic levelled against the vision-theory.[2] It is, in a word, that Jesus sends a telegram and does not himself come. Incontestably, Paul and Peter believed that Jesus was himself there; the message sent, therefore, was not wholly true. What Jesus ought to have telegraphed, according to Keim's view, is this, "Be of good cheer; I am alive in Heaven." The message actually received, according to the unanimous testimony of the recipients, was this, "I am myself here with you, in actual presence." "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" cries out Paul, passionately. "No," replies Keim, "you have received a telegram from him."[3]

In short, with all our desire to penetrate by the

[1] Keim, pp. 601–606 (Eng. tr., pp. 360–365). Substantially the same view in J. Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi*, 1895, p. 59, and Korff, pp. 236–245.

[2] *Supra*, p. 44.

[3] For a similar criticism of Keim *cf.* A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, 1892, p. 393. An excellent presentation and criticism of Keim's view is given by Steude, pp. 96–112.

process of critical investigation into the reality behind the experiences we are discussing, we must be careful not to substitute something else for the concrete thing which these experiences attested to their recipients. It was not the fact of immortality, it was not the fact that Jesus was above in the heavenly life; it was the fact that Jesus came to certain men and showed himself. The other two facts are of course presupposed as the condition of this fact, but they do not form the central significance of the experience. We may, with Holsten and Schmiedel, decide that the reality we seek was a series of subjective visions, psychologically conditioned. We may, with Keim, find it in subjective visions brought about by the direct action of Jesus, or of God, from heaven. Only let us clearly recognise that in either case we are deciding that a hallucination took place, that the men to whom the visions came were deceived as to their real significance.

Now I do not wish to argue either for or against the vision-hypothesis, or the telegram-hypothesis. The arguments for the former are easily accessible in Holsten's book and Schmiedel's article, are well summed up indeed by Keim, who does full justice to the view he would correct.[1] The counter-arguments may be read in Beyschlag's *Leben Jesu* and a host of apologetic works.[2] One thing is clear; if the experi-

[1] The noblest expression of the vision-hypothesis is to be found in Martineau, pp. 358–377.

[2] Beyschlag, pp. 450–470. Further, John Kennedy, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ an Historical Fact*, Revised Ed., 1895; James Marchant, *Theories of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1899; Orr, chap. viii.

ences of Peter and the others were really subjective hallucinations, psychological phenomena, pure and simple, then their study and investigation must be the task of a trained psychologist. So far as they are of direct importance, it is to his field. There is no reason why the New Testament scholar, whose field is that of literary and historical investigation, should assume the ability to investigate these psychic phenomena, just because they are reported in the Bible, when similar phenomena in modern times demand the keenest processes of the most highly trained psychological expert. Nor is there any reason why the New Testament scholar should feel any further duty in the matter after he has demonstrated, as he believes, that the phenomena belong entirely to the realm of mental processes, normal or abnormal. At that point his task is done, and he hands over the phenomena to the expert in the field of mind-action. No one can justly criticise him for going no further. To be sure, many upholders of the vision-theory, notably Holsten and Pfleiderer,[1] have combined the

[1] Holsten, pp. 84–111, and (for the case of Peter) pp. 210–234; pp. 211–216 analyse Peter's mental constitution, pp. 216–234 deal with the external influences upon his mind. O. Pfleiderer, *Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity*, Hibbert Lectures, 1885, pp. 31–44; *Urchristentum*, pp. 60–67. Further, F. C. Baur, *Paulus*, 1845, pp. 651 ff.; R. W. Macan, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1877, ch. ii.; Clemen, pp. 207–210; Schmiedel, cols. 4081–2 and 4084–5. Brandt's picture, pp. 496–505, is somewhat too complex and artificial. Arnold Meyer, pp. 272–315, offers an interesting and valuable discussion of the psychological conditions of the visions, which Korff (pp. 160–184) subjects to a searching criticism, in part very just. Korff's point (pp. 184–186) that the visions

tasks of the historian and the psychologist, and have attempted to trace, especially in the case of the apostle Paul, the psychological antecedents of the vision. It is not for the non-expert to decide as to the measure of their success, but it must be noted that their psychological construction and the deductions from it have met with the keenest criticism—again from the theologians and New Testament scholars. One would be grateful for a thoroughgoing criticism of Holsten's work, for example, from an expert psychologist. Lacking that, the layman is constrained to feel that if the visions of Jesus which Paul lists were subjective creations of the recipients' minds, their genesis is clearly to be sought in the fashion indicated by Holsten and Pfleiderer.

Certain arguments, at any rate, urged against the vision-theory, are trivial. Thus it is not true that were the appearances subjective visions, they would necessarily have occurred with much greater frequency and have been prolonged over a much longer period.[1] As a matter of fact, we do not know to just how many people Jesus "appeared," nor at just what intervals, and the limit of such appearances has not yet been reached. So soon as our horizon becomes wider than the New Testament, we come

---

were not merely ecstatic, but were projected into the setting of real life, deserves especial notice. If Meyer's psychological explanation of the visions is inadequate (Korff, pp. 193–195), it is only because any explanation of psychic experiences of others, between whom and ourselves lie nineteen centuries, bridged by only brief testimony, must of necessity be inadequate.

[1] This is urged, among many others, by Beyschlag, p. 460; Keim, pp. 597 f. (Eng. tr., pp. 355 f.); Orr, p. 223; Korff, pp. 206 f.

upon a long list of devout men and women who, according to their own testimony—as Peter and Paul, according to theirs—have been granted visions of Jesus.[1] These cases of course need critical investigation, but to say *a priori* that all those outside the New Testament are delusions, or that the appearances after the year 35 A.D. (Paul's conversion) have been of a totally different sort from those before that date is to beg the question in the most unscientific and arbitrary fashion. There is more modesty than absolute chronology in Paul's "last of all to me." But further, there is no psychological authority for the statement of the theologians, that "subjective visions" must necessarily continue to propagate themselves for an extended period. A series of such experiences might as conceivably close with the fifth or tenth repetition as with the hundredth, after a period of days as after several months or years. As a matter of fact, the history of such phenomena tends to show that they most commonly die out in a brief time, as seems, indeed, antecedently probable. At any rate, there is not yet sufficient evidence to exclude phenomena from the class of "subjective visions" because they recur less than a given number of times.

We must also dispute the cogency of the statement commonly heard, that the results of these visions prove their veridical character.[2] This is plainly illegitimate reasoning, or rather, the substitution of sentiment for reasoning. It can have no absolute

[1] *Cf.* the excellent summary of many such cases in Arnold Meyer, pp. 217–272.

[2] *E.g.*, Orr, p. 206. *Cf.* C. G. Montefiore: *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. i., 1909, p. 385.

validity; it demands the antecedent conviction that the beliefs, customs, and institutions held to be the resultants of these visions are right and beneficent. Clearly for the millions outside the Christian system, or to those who regard its historical doctrines as error and its historical activity as largely pernicious, this argument could have no weight. We may most energetically differ from the judgments of such men, but we have no right to offer to them, as proofs of something they ought to accept, considerations not valid until they have accepted it.[1]

But further, the principle of arguing from the beneficence of any institution to the correctness of the ideas held by the founders of that institution needs only to be stated to be condemned. An institution like the Christian church, with all its faiths and forms and activities, is the resultant of an infinite number of influences, exerted during all the years of its history, influences which in turn grew out of an infinitely great and complex series of concepts and ideas. Some of these remain valid for the twentieth century; most of them do not. But the conceptions we now label error have not been the least effective in shaping the moral and intellectual world in which we are glad and proud to live. A correct presentation of the demonology, anthropology and theology of the characters of the New Testament would without doubt be rejected *in toto* by any orthodox Christian of the present day, yet these conceptions were the

[1] It is imperatively necessary that Christian theologians should learn to write with a larger reading public in mind than the membership of the Christian church. Until they do so, their books cannot even approach absolute validity.

conditions for the spread of the Christian religion. Out of the religion of these men grew ours, not out of their cult, still less out of the ideas by which they tried to adjust that religion to their environment and daily experience. The Kingdom of God is the eternal ideal of man, though the dualism which gave to the concept its original name and shape be as forgotten as Rahab and Behemoth.

The Christian church is dependent on the disciples' faith, but not on the accuracy of that faith. In all history, man's faith has been the great shaping force of human institutions, but its effectiveness has never been conditioned on its conformity to some abstract standard of "truth." Even if we pay no heed to that modern philosophic voice which declares that there is no such abstract standard, that an idea's truth *is* its effectiveness, and nothing beside, we must yet realise that very few of human conceptions have yet been submitted to a standard so absolute that the judgment of the future may not revise our own. Specifically, the faith of Peter and Paul being what it was, the results would be what they were and are, quite irrespective of the correctness of that faith.

Finally, it is important also that we make clear to ourselves what is involved in the acceptance of a theory like Keim's—subjective visions generated not by the active presence, but by the distant activity of the risen Jesus. As Keim clearly says, this is purely an act of faith. It is not reached by any process of historic investigation; there can be for it no external proof. The soul believes it, or fails to believe it; the historian can be of no help, nor has he any right of question. So far as concerns what

actually took place, within the physical world, we have still the subjective vision of the other theory, whose further investigation we must leave to the psychologist.

The common arguments against the vision-hypothesis, then, lack cogency. As a matter of fact, argumentation here is commonly misdirected. There needs no argument *for* the vision-hypothesis. Paul and the Twelve admit that they had visions. What the upholder of the hypothesis *must* do is to show why the view of the recipients that the visions were veridical is untenable. All his arguments for the vision may be admitted by Peter, who yet declares, "But the vision had its objective counterpart and cause in the real presence of Jesus." *How does Holsten know this is not true?* What we need is a valid consideration, not for the vision, but against its veridical interpretation. Have the champions of the vision-hypothesis given it to us? So far as I can see, they have not. Nor can they easily do so, on any historical or scientific grounds. The real argument, as it lies in their minds, is that their *Weltanschauung* does not admit of such phenomena as "veridical appearances of the dead." It is an act of faith which denies the reality behind the visions; it was an act of faith in Paul and the disciples which affirmed it. What they *knew* was the vision; what they *believed* was the very presence of the living Lord.

The view of Holsten conceives the vision as the final reality of the experience, the view of Keim conceives the action of Jesus as that final reality, the view of Paul conceives the reality to be the actual presence of the one who is seen. We have just

been seeing that in the nature of the case little or nothing can be urged against this view, except its non-agreement with our view of the world. On the other hand, very little argument can be used for this view; its acceptance was originally, perhaps must always be, an act of faith. If little argument can be offered, it is also true that little is needed. The veridical interpretation has the great advantage that it is the natural explanation, which would at once be accepted by every one, unless good grounds could be urged against it. We see a friend; the immediate, inevitable assumption is that the friend is there. Only if we have strong reason for believing that the friend is elsewhere do we question the reality of our impression. So in the present instance, the absolute conviction of Peter and the other recipients of the "visions" that their departed Master was there, revealing his actual presence through the avenue of the sense of sight, needs no defence. They could not avoid it. If it be questioned, *the entire burden of proof is on the questioner.* It must be that he has some valid reason for believing that Jesus was not there. What is that reason, and who has put it clearly and convincingly? Is it enough to say: Jesus was dead, therefore he could not be there? Until this is proved enough, the natural interpretation of Peter has no call to defend itself by any argument. So much we ought to concede.

At the same time we must recognise that our *Weltanschauung* must be for all of us a valid ground for disbelief in many things which ancient testimony urges upon our credence. On this ground we reject the phœnix and the conversion of water into wine at

Cana. For most of these things argumentation either for or against is puerile or futile. They are, it need scarcely be said, neither believed nor denied on genuine evidence. It is, to be sure, wholly illegitimate to believe statements of historical fact, save on grounds of historical evidence. Yet no one who knows the meaning of words can claim that he has real evidence sufficient to prove that Jesus turned water into wine, while, on the other hand, the man who denies the historicity of this marvel may well be quite helpless when asked: How do you know it did not happen? What evidence have you against it, when the only existing account of the circumstances is *for* the miracle?

As to the real presence of Jesus behind the "appearances" of him, then, the question at issue is finally this: Are we to have a view of the world which allows of such real presence, capable of self-manifestation to one (or more?) physical senses of living men? Paul's world-view allowed that. Shall ours?

To Paul's experience we can no longer apply any test. But if it were simply a question of this one isolated appearance in all history, if of Jesus alone had men claimed that to them was manifested his real presence after death, we might have little hesitation in adopting a world-view which excludes this apparent exception to otherwise universal experience. We might properly decide that the interpretation of these phenomena by those who experienced them was mistaken, that they were, one and all, victims of a "hallucination." Perhaps it is too early to shape our world-view at this point, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the case of Jesus does not

stand alone. To the witness of Paul is being added similar testimony, as perfectly authenticated, from all times and lands, of parallel phenomena. We must avoid all dogmatism, but in view of the increasing body of witness accumulated by modern scientific psychic research, we need just now to guard ourselves especially against the dogmatic assertion that Paul's interpretation of his own experience was necessarily mistaken.

The question is a simple one. It is not: was Jesus still alive, a sentient spirit in a new environment? Of that we are as assured as was Paul, if the Christian faith is ours. It is not: did Paul and others have "appearances" which they identified with the local presence of this living and glorified spirit? Of that we may be as sure as of any statement of ancient history. It is simply: do these two things connect? Was the "appearance" actually a manifestation of the departed spirit?

It is precisely the same question to whose answering the Society for Psychic Research hopes to make a contribution by its collecting and sifting of data. Granted that we cannot yet with confidence answer it in the affirmative, we must surely be even less confident with a negative response. Professor Lake[1] makes a tentative but wholly correct statement of the case. "Criticism and philosophy . . . do not at all impugn the fact of appearances. And at this point the psychologist comes into the discussion, and says that such appearances are not isolated phenomena; but he is not yet quite ready to say what expla-

[1] Pp. 275 f. *Cf.* also J. O. F. Murray, in *Cambridge Theological Essays*, 1905, p. 340.

nation he wishes to give of them; perhaps they are proofs that personality survives death in a form which does not exclude the possibility of communications; perhaps they are proofs of as yet unfathomed possibilities of the influence of living personality and of unconscious thought which suddenly reaches the plane of consciousness, and manifests itself there in the form of 'appearances' or 'messages.' So we seem to see the possibility that the discussion of the Resurrection will in the future enter on a new phase; but it is impossible here to attempt to forestall what this new period may bring."

It is possible to speak more certainly than this. If the future generations are to believe in the veridical reality of the appearances of Jesus at all, they must do so only by considering that these appearances are not unique, exceptions to otherwise universal human experience. They must believe that Jesus appeared *just because* these alleged appearances are not unique, but fit in with a succession of similar phenomena sufficiently extensive and well-authenticated to compel assent.

"Our ever-growing recognition of the continuity, the uniformity, of cosmic law has gradually made of the alleged *uniqueness* of any incident its almost inevitable refutation."[1] These words of Mr. Myers contain the sufficient criticism of most of the apologetic treatment of Jesus' resurrection. His further words compel quotation. "Ever more clearly must our age of science realise that any relation between a material and a spiritual world cannot be an ethical or

[1] F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, 1903, vol. ii., p. 288.

an emotional relation alone; that it must needs be a great structural fact of the Universe, involving laws at least as persistent, as identical from age to age, as our known laws of Energy or of Motion. And especially as to that central claim, of the soul's life manifested after the body's death, it is plain that this can less and less be supported by remote tradition alone; that it must more and more be tested by modern experience and inquiry. Suppose, for instance, that we collect many such histories, recorded on first-hand evidence in our critical age; and suppose that all these narratives break down on analysis; that they can all be traced to hallucination, mis-description, and other persistent sources of error; —can we then expect reasonable men to believe that this marvellous phenomenon, always vanishing into nothingness when closely scrutinised in a modern English scene, must yet compel adoring credence when alleged to have occurred in an Oriental country, and in a remote and superstitious age?"

Here is a plea that compels our assent. On the one hand, it can no longer be considered a scientific procedure to dismiss the appearances of Jesus as subjective hallucinations, without consideration of the evidence for similar phenomena which is in increasing fulness being put at our disposal. On the other, it is even more clearly folly to accept without question the accuracy of the scanty records of the appearances of Jesus nineteen centuries ago, together with the accuracy of their recipients' interpretation of them, while rejecting or ignoring the large body of carefully sifted and authenticated evidence

for the same phenomena in the case of others.[1] Most unscientific and arbitrary is that complete begging of the question which asserts *a priori* the entire dissimilarity of these parallels to the case of Jesus, and therefore their entire irrelevance. Those who urge this objection seem to demand an exact duplication of the case of Jesus, including all its dogmatic and historic results, a demand palpably absurd. "No single example can be produced of belief in the resurrection of an historical personage such as Jesus was: none at least on which anything was ever founded. . . . The Christian resurrection is thus a fact without historical analogy. . . . It is not necessary here to investigate the degree of truth which belongs to the class of phenomena with which psychical research deals, . . . what it is necessary to insist upon is that nothing of the kind answers to the proper Scriptural idea of Resurrection, and that it is a mistake, involving a real yielding up of the Christian basis, to rest the proof of Christ's rising from the dead in any degree on *data* so elusive, precarious and in this connexion, so misleading, as those to which attention is here directed."[2] In these words of Dr. Orr speaks

[1] That evidence is most conveniently presented in Mr. Myers's work, already quoted. The most complete source is probably the *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychic Research. Very valuable, also, is the list of visions (with sources) given by Arnold Meyer, pp. 217–272.

[2] Orr, pp. 224, 228 f. *Cf.* Korff, p. 187, and W. D. Mackenzie in *American Journal of Theology*, Oct., 1908, p. 580. "The pathetic hunger of the Society of Psychical Research for some indubitable proof that some private individual has appeared to his friends must ever, for the Christian man, seem something like a mockery, in view of the Resurrection of Christ, the Son of Man."

the dogmatist, not the historian. The dissimilarity between the case of Jesus and those of others lies for this writer in the fact that Jesus' appearances were believed to be, and actually were, the appearances of his reanimated physical body, while the others are not commonly understood as having such relation to the buried body. Even if this understanding were wholly true, the physical character of Jesus' resurrection appearances is precisely the matter in dispute. Prove that, and of course all discussion would be at an end.

So far, at any rate, we have found nothing in the apostolic testimony which hints at such an interpretation. Of Jesus Paul declares, "he died . . . he was buried . . . he appeared." So much has been claimed for hundreds more, on as good evidence as Paul affords us. Where is the difference, save in the dogmatic presuppositions and conclusions drawn by Christians in various generations, from the appearances of Jesus? That precisely similar interpretations have not been drawn from other appearances has surely no bearing against the essential identity of the phenomena interpreted.[1]

From the standpoint of the scientific study of history, therefore, there is nothing to forbid our acceptance as a statement of literal accuracy Paul's testimony: he died, was buried; *he was seen* by Cephas, by the Twelve, by more than five hundred brethren, by James, by all the apostles, by Paul himself. It

[1] An anonymous book, *Resurrectio Christi*, London, 1909, attempts to make a contribution to the study of Jesus' resurrection from the standpoint of psychic research. The attempt cannot be regarded as successful.

may be that philosophical or psychological considerations will forbid one or another student to posit any ***objective*** reality behind the appearances; the phenomenal reality of the appearances themselves is beyond historical question.[1]

[1] *Cf.* J. Wendland, *Der Wunderglaube im Christentum*, 1910, pp. 112 f.

CHAPTER III

HOW ARE THE DEAD RAISED?

"HE appeared to Cephas," then, and in turn to the Twelve, to more than five hundred disciples at once, most of whom were still living when Paul wrote, to James (without doubt Jesus' brother is meant),[1] to all the apostles, and last of all to Paul himself. That Jesus was risen and had attested his resurrection by these appearances, that is the preaching of Paul and the earliest apostles alike. The sense of this declaration seems clear. There is no indication that these things were ever questioned by any Christian.

But in Corinth there is skepticism as to a further claim of the *kerygma*. "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" or, more literally, "that there is not a rising of dead ones?" Christ has been raised out from among the company of dead persons (ἐκ νεκρῶν), there is therefore a rising of dead persons (νεκρῶν without article or preposition). There follows in vss. 12 to 19 a convincing argument against the skeptics, convincing because they admit the resurrection of Jesus. Of *one* who was dead there has been a resurrection; therefore the possibility is

[1] So most. F. L. Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn u. s. w.*, 1871, p. 167, thinks of James Zebedaei.

established for others, the universal negative is broken.

But Paul goes further; it is not merely a possibility for others, the one case gives the promise and the potency of resurrection for all who are Christ's. But as it is indeed (νυνὶ δὲ), Messiah has been raised out from among the dead as a first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep. Messiah is the first-fruits; *i.e.*, what has happened to him is precisely what is to happen to all believers, only it has happened to him *first*. That is the only point of difference; in his case the resurrection came in three days after death, for others it is a matter of months or years. But the resurrection in each case is exactly the same thing. An interesting contribution to Paul's idea of Jesus' resurrection might therefore be made from a collation of all that he says about the resurrection he expects for others. The phrase in Col. i: 18, "the first-born from the dead," though perhaps not from Paul's pen, is a perfect expression of his thought.[1] Only in his priority has Jesus a pre-eminence over the rest of "those who have fallen asleep." The latter phrase (τῶν κεκοιμημένων, vs. 20) takes up the οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν χριστῷ of vs. 18, and (as in I. Thess. iv: 13 ff. and commonly in the N. T.) has in mind the Christian dead, those who are to rise into the glorified life of the kingdom. Paul would have used a less tender word for the unbelieving dead.[2]

[1] *Cf.* also Acts xxvi: 23, "he first," etc. For discussion of other Pauline utterances concerning the resurrection, *cf. infra*, Ch. IV.

[2] Teichmann, pp. 26 f., on the basis of I. Cor. xi: 30 and I. Thess. iv: 13, thinks that the period of sleep can be at best "kein angenehmer," indeed, that it is positively painful. This is

In fact, the resurrection in mind in the discussion of this whole chapter is the rising of the righteous; the "all" of vs. 22 is explained in vs. 23 as "they that are Christ's," and vs. 22 itself may easily be translated, "For as all (who are) in Adam die, so also all (who are) in Christ shall be made alive."[1] Verse 18 also has no meaning except as those who have "fallen asleep in Christ" have, *in contrast to all others*, hope of resurrection. Those who rise to the spiritual body, in glory and power, who are to bear the image of the heavenly, are by hypothesis the Christian dead, the "dead who shall rise incorruptible" of vs. 52. There is here no explanation of the fate of the evil and unbelieving; Paul is thinking only of the promise for the just.

Resurrection is a thing to be attained (Phil. iii: 11); it can be attained only by the true Christian, and may be missed if one is unfaithful. Even Paul might miss it, and be rejected; it is a prize, a reward for faithful striving. Compare I. Cor. xv: 24–27 with Phil. iii: 10–14. Indeed, since Paul's definition of resurrection, as here used, is the assumption of the spiritual body, a process mediated only through relationship to Messiah, it is axiomatic that only

---

quite foreign to Paul's intention in using the word. Teichmann is more correct in calling the κοιμᾶσθαι, a few sentences farther on, "die mōglichst milde Vorstellung." So Thackeray, p. 108, note, is misleading when he draws from I. Cor. xi: 30 that the "sleep" may be "spoken of as a punishment."

[1] So Charles, p. 391. Charles's following pages demonstrate clearly Paul's limitation of resurrection to the righteous. So also Richard Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, 1893, pp. 267 ff., and many others. Acts xxiv: 15 is only one of many passages in which Pseudo-Luke misconceives Paul.

Christians are raised. "There can be no resurrection but in Christ" (Charles). This is the clear teaching also of Paul's words in I. Thess. iv: 13–18. In this passage there is no allusion whatever to any but Christians, except the reference in vs. 13 to "the rest," who are distinctly declared to have *no hope* (of resurrection). They "that are fallen asleep in Jesus" are those who shall rise like Jesus; "the dead in Christ shall rise," and they who are alive in Christ shall join them. For any others there is no resurrection.

This conception of resurrection as a prize attained only by the righteous is one of many elements which justify Paul's proud boast of being "a Hebrew of Hebrews, as touching the law, a Pharisee" (Phil. iii: 5).[1] For it was the dogma of the Pharisees, in distinction from certain of the apocalyptic representations, that only the righteous were to share in the resurrection. So at least Josephus distinctly tells us.[2] This view is prominent in the Pharisaic "Psalms of Solomon," and is found even in some of the apocalyptists.[3]

Much as Jesus dissented from the Pharisaic spirit, he seems clearly to have shared this view of theirs as to resurrection. They who rise from the dead are like angels in heaven, living unto God (Mk. xii: 24–27). The seven husbands of the one wife in the Sadducees' story are all pious Israelites, strictly obedient to the

[1] So Acts xxiii: 6–9 makes Paul agree with the Pharisees as to the resurrection.

[2] *Ant.*, xviii., 14; *Bell. Jud.*, ii., 163. *Cf.* Bousset, pp. 312 f. Volz, p. 242.

[3] Volz, pp. 240–243; Haller, p. 278, and the quotation from *Bereschith Rabba* on his p. 282.

law. Luke's phrasing (xx: 35 f.) of Jesus' words only emphasises this aspect. "They that are accounted worthy to attain to . . . the resurrection from the dead . . . are equal to the angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection." This is not a picture of the future of any but the righteous.[1] The judgment of the wicked (as in the great picture Mat. xxv: 31 ff.) does not imply, but rather denies, their resurrection. Devils, fallen angels, Satan himself, are judged, but do not rise.[2]

This limitation of resurrection to the righteous is found elsewhere in the New Testament, as Professor Charles shows. It is always found where resurrection *means what Paul means by it.* Where it means merely presentation for judgment, it is an idea with which we are not here concerned.[3] For the Christian the judgment is past, and the resurrection itself already

[1] Charles, pp. 340–342. Charles strangely urges that Luke, as shown by the words "all live unto him," in xx: 38, contrary to Jesus, Mat., and Mark, believes in the resurrection of the wicked also. *Cf.* Lk. xiv: 14, "resurrection of the just."

[2] Charles, p. 343. So such sayings as Mat. xi: 22 and 24, xii: 41 f. do not imply *resurrection* for any but the just.

[3] This is correctly put by Arthur Titius, *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, 1900, pp. 51 f. *Cf.* further F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, 2te Auflage, 1897, pp. 390 f. "Die Auferstehung der Todten ist also nach der Jüdischen Theologie ein Vorrecht derer, die am Reiche Gottes Anteil haben sollen. . . . Wer keinen künftigen Lohn hat, wird auch an der Auferstehung nicht Teil haben." Alongside this view was taught that the wicked shall be judged at the last day. John v: 29, like so much of the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, is a non-Jewish utterance. The Didache (xvi: 7) distinctly shares the Jewish, Pauline view. "The resurrection of the dead, not, however, of all, but . . . *all the saints.*" Thackeray, pp. 120–122, argues

mystically experienced in the baptismal act of entrance into the Christian community.

It may be noted that in the chapter under discussion Paul uses νεκροί (dead persons) nine times and οἱ νεκροί (*the* dead) only four times. This proportion is due to the fact that his mind is thus occupied with certain ones, namely, "the saints," who are dead, rather than with "the dead" as a whole. As death came upon men in the person of Adam, so their making alive comes in the person of the Messiah, each of these two being the prototype in whom the common experience is first realised, as well as the one through whose act the common experience comes to humanity. Adam is the first-fruits of sinning man, the Messiah of man raised to life in the spiritual body. That Christians are baptised in behalf of departed friends, a practice familiar to the Corinthians, if not to us moderns; nay, that Paul himself risks his life daily in his work as a proclaimer of the gospel, posit the resurrection, and find their only

---

that Paul believes in resurrection of evil as well as of good, on the basis of the πάντες of I. Cor. xv: 22 and the phrase "each in his own order." The rising of Jesus cannot be styled a τάγμα, therefore the "each" must be justified by a second τάγμα (the righteous being the first), which must be the wicked. Their resurrection Thackeray places in the interval between "his parousia" and "the end," for εἶτα τὸ τέλος means, he urges, "then after an interval." This seems like eisegesis rather than exegesis. Thackeray further discovers allusion to the resurrection of the wicked in I. Cor. vi: 2, xi: 32; Rom. ii: 5 ff., all passages which allude merely to the judgment of the wicked, which, as we have seen, does not imply their resurrection. He admits that Phil. iii: 11 teaches the resurrection only of the righteous, without trying to make Paul consistent with himself.

justification in its sure hope. Else let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.

But the skeptics' question at this point becomes more precise, and emphasises the real difficulty. What is it they are doubting? Not at all the soul's immortality, an idea not strange or unwelcome to the Greek mind.[1] Not the resurrection of Jesus, which they accept as a fundamental condition of their being Christians at all. They are doubting the resurrection of Christians in general, because the word "resurrection" posits not merely personal continuance or immortality, but a rising or returning into a conscious life, analogous to this life, and, like this life, in association with a body. Let it be repeated, resurrection meant, to Paul and his readers alike, not that the soul continues to exist, but that it is re-embodied, that it has another life. The very word ἀνάστασις, up-standing, *Auferstehung*, posits the ancient view of the *lower* world, Hades, *up* from which souls may come. It meant always for these first-century men, Jews and Greeks alike, Josephus, Paul and the Corinthians, *resurrection of the body*, or better, resurrection in the body.[2]

[1] Lake, p. 14, is inaccurate in statement here.

[2] The ἀνά of ἀνάστασις does not mean up from the *grave*, but from Hades. Ancient graves were not so commonly dug down into the flat ground as with us, but more often in the side of a hill or bank, so that a body, in emerging, would not naturally come *up* at all. The verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω are both used, in this connection, with reference to the underworld as the point of departure. Meyer–Heinrici *ad* I. Cor. vi: 14 (1896, p. 203) makes an arbitrary mis-statement in explaining the ἐξ of ἐξεγερεῖ there and of ἐξανάστασις in Phil. iii: 11 by: "aus den Gräbern." The ἐκ νεκρῶν following the latter word gives the true reference of the ἐξ. Teichmann, p. 26, is also in error here.

There was not for these men that confusion of the concepts immortality and resurrection which is now almost universal in Christian churches, if one may judge from the sermons heard everywhere on Easter Sunday. Immortality means simply that the soul does not perish with the body, but has an indestructible, endless existence. Resurrection, usually taking immortality for granted, means that the soul gets, after death, new embodiment and life, analogous to our present state. Belief in immortality was held in one or another form by multitudes in the ancient world who did not share the added hope of resurrection. It is possible, indeed, to believe in resurrection without believing in permanent immortality. The soul might live a thousand or ten thousand years, with a multitude of resurrections into new life and embodiment, only at last to cease to be. Resurrection can not possibly say anything about permanent immortality; it tells only of one life-period succeeding this one. Whether that period shall have an end, after the analogy of this period, it is absolutely unable even to hint. Permanent immortality is necessarily forever incapable of proof or demonstration; belief in it is forever an act of faith. Not until the preachers in our churches see this simple fact clearly, will our Easter sermons cease to be confused presentations of a double proposition, and become really convincing.

Taking the spiritistic hypothesis as proven, in the case of the appearances of Jesus and of all the rest, on its foundation we can be promised only that we shall live *again*, not that we shall live *forever*. The bodily resurrection of Jesus proves nothing for our own future; his spiritual resurrection may prove a

future life for us; only an act of faith can make us confident of everlasting life. There is no reason why two life-periods should have appreciably more value in demonstrating eternal existence than has one. In either case we must take the leap of faith and declare that second period unending, or, if ending, to be succeeded by a third endless period, or an endless succession of periods. If I shall find myself alive in some heavenly world a million ages from now, I shall still have only the assurance of faith that my life shall not end. The ages that lie behind me cannot guarantee it in the least. They may furnish what seems a strong presumption, but that presumption is largely deprived of its strength by the reflection that in the endlessness of eternity a million ages is but a vanishing moment.

Our very word "eternal" is a monument to a sublime act of human faith. Meaning literally "pertaining to the (next) age, or life-period," we have by faith imported into it the added significance of "unending," because our hearts have assured us that the life of the next period will be unending. Precisely the same thing was done by devout Jews and Christians, in the four centuries within which the ministry of Jesus forms the central dividing line, with the Greek equivalent of the Latin *æternus*, *æternalis*, αἰώνιος. ζωὴ αἰώνιος, literally the life of the (next) aeon or age, became, for their faith, life everlasting. The chief good of that blessed future age was that in it night and death and all ending should be no more. Death itself should die, and end should have an end.

For Paul and his readers, then, resurrection was not synonymous with the soul's endless life, but posited

it; it was the entrance upon that life in its most blessed form. It was the assumption by the purified soul of a new body, the beginning of a new and richer series of those social and spiritual relations which make the real content of "life."

Now this idea was peculiarly a Jewish one. The Greeks and Romans, in large measure, believed in immortality, that is, in bodiless persistence of the soul, usually conceived as rather dismal and contentless, even at the best. Christianity did not come to them with any promise of immortality merely; that promise would not have meant to them what it means to us, would not have kindled their aspirations and enlisted their eager adherence to such a degree as we might at first suppose. For we, when we say immortality, mean immortality *plus* resurrection; we mean *Christian* immortality, not mere continuance of the soul, but new *life* for the soul, in the fullest, richest significance of that term. And from the beginning, Christians have asserted their faith in the resurrection of the body, by which, whatever the phrase may have meant in detail to various minds in various years, has always been meant fundamentally the soul's endowment with some organism or medium through which its desires and emotions and volitions might come to expression, through which it might really *live*, as opposed to its mere persistence as a pale "shade," helpless, hopeless, vague, and ineffectual.

This was the great hope and promise which Paul came preaching to the Corinthians and to the Gentiles everywhere. It was not a hope new to Jewish thought and aspiration. Jesus and thousands of his fellows had cherished it devoutly; it had been Paul's own

from his youth up, long before he became a Christian. This part of his gospel fell familiarly on the ears of his hearers of the synagogue, and found easy acceptance. But to the *savants* of Athens, the apostle seemed to be a setter forth of strange divinities, because he preached Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις; to their ears he brought strange things.

And so in Corinth Paul's message is not permanently appropriated without skepticism. The Greeks there accept the resurrection of Jesus, as a special instance, wrought by divine power for a special end; but that for them all the same great renewal is waiting, that every death among their company, as distinguished from those without, shall be followed by resurrection, to this faith some among them cannot hold fast, as the passage of time weakens the enthusiasm and ardour of their first believing, Then they received it unquestioningly, as a part of the redeeming gospel, carried away by the rush of glad emotion, as from their poor and unclean lives they were called by Paul's demonstration of the Spirit and of power into the exalted life of saints who shall judge the world and the angels, whose bodies are the veritable temples of the most high God. Then, we may easily believe, following Paul's suggestion, some of them believed εἰκῇ, rashly, impulsively, without due reflection or complete intellectual conviction. Now time has done its calming work; the intellectual problem asserts itself. The skepticism that was only buried, not removed, lifts its head.

Nothing is more striking in the Corinthian epistle than its revelation of the intellectualism that characterised that congregation, or at least a large portion

of it. Their great word of boasting was: "we know." γνῶσις and its cognates are written large through the whole epistle, and the pride of knowledge lies at the bottom of most of the faults which the apostle must rebuke. The criticism of Paul by the partisans of Apollos is for the lack of γνῶσις and intellectual superiority in his address, as the first four chapters so pointedly indicate. It was knowledge which so puffed up a large part of the congregation as to render it superior to the common morality in its relation to incestuous intercourse and intimacy with notorious evil-doers. It was knowledge that led some men into celibacy and asceticism, others into license and free participation in idolatrous gatherings and the use of sacrificial meats. It was knowledge that made certain of the women superior to the social principles and conventions of the time, and men superior to their ignorant and indigent brethren. Knowledge leads to the preference for tongue-speaking among the spiritual gifts, and the lawless conduct of divine service; it is knowledge, finally, that declares there is no resurrection of the dead. The whole letter is a discussion of the rival claims of knowledge and of love as guides of Christian conduct. Its central sentences are: knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up. Though I know all mysteries and all knowledge, and have not love, I am nothing.[1]

[1] It is illuminating to study chapter thirteen with special reference to the words γινώσκω, γνῶσις, and their cognates, noticing also other terms referring to intellectual activity. The whole epistle, studied from this point of view, gains notable significance, in particular the first four chapters. The point is briefly treated by G. Hollmann: *Urchristentum in Corinth*, 1903, pp. 10-18.

It is, then, an intellectual consideration that gives pause to certain among the converts. Resurrection, entrance upon a future life in the body, how is that possible? How do the dead rise, and with what sort of body do they come? The body is put into the grave and decays; how then can it be raised in newness of life? In other words, these Corinthian skeptics are thinking of the "body" of the resurrection life as in some way the body possessed before death; restored, renewed, glorified, but in substance and continuance the same body. Here we find the first record of belief in resurrection as concerned with the physical body, a belief which is *promptly and definitely characterised by Paul as erroneous belief and corrected in detail.* Yet it becomes the belief of the writers of the gospels, more particularly of the three later gospels. Plainly the view held and preached by Paul as to the resurrection and its attestations is here in Corinth being somehow misapprehended and obscured. Plainly he means by the resurrection-body something other than the buried body of flesh and bone.

The conception of the physical body as the body with which resurrection has to do may, indeed, have arisen in Gentile circles, possibly in Jewish circles, of the church, at an earlier period than this; it was a natural, perhaps an inevitable, confusion, in that time and among the less reflective classes who everywhere made the chief response to the Christian preaching. But our records reveal it first here in Corinth. It grew and ultimately prevailed; in the gospels it has become orthodoxy.[1]

[1] Clement of Rome, who writes at about the same time with Matthew, probably a little earlier than Luke (Gospel–Acts),

The conception produced two different and opposed effects, in different classes of minds. Of one, the Corinthian skeptics are typical; of the other, the gospel of Luke. In Corinth men said: Resurrection is predicated of the (physical) body; the physical body decays, therefore resurrection does not take place. Luke said: Resurrection is predicated of the (physical) body; resurrection is our dearest and deepest conviction, therefore the physical body rises.[1] The whole conception becomes thereby materialised; resurrection comes to be concerned with the corpse, and to lie wholly within the sense-realm. The skepticism seems to have been limited to few, and not to have persisted within Christian circles, perhaps owing to the very effective way in which it was met by Paul.

---

much earlier than John, has very clearly the idea of resurrection as revival and renewal of the buried body. He first among Christian writers makes use of the figure of the phœnix, and in citing Job xix: 26 as a proof-text, he makes it read *καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην*, where the MSS. of the LXX read either *τὸ δέρμα* or *τὸ σῶμα*. Paul is no longer understood, though Clement is familiar with I. Cor., and is writing to the same church. By the middle of the second century all sense of what Paul had meant was everywhere lost in orthodox Christian circles, and the view that the buried body had been revived held undisputed possession of the field. *Cf.* Haller, pp. 294-298. Only the Gnostics were truer to Paul's thought, truer, indeed, than a host of modern commentators. Haller, pp. 300-313.

For the development of the view of the resurrection after Paul, *cf.* C. K. Staudt: *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period*, 1909.

[1] Of course "Luke" is not here expressing the result of his own reasoning on the matter, so much as reflecting without question the prevailing church belief of his time and environment.

This result was not wholly fortunate, for Paul's words were very early understood, as they have been understood ever since, to rebuke the skepticism and to assert what the skeptics doubted. He does indeed rebuke the skepticism that says there is no resurrection; but he sees the misunderstanding on which that skepticism is based, and proceeds to correct it in careful detail. He does *not* say: Resurrection is predicated of the (physical) body; resurrection is proven, therefore the physical body rises. He says: Resurrection is proven; resurrection means future life in the body, therefore we shall live in the body; *but this body is not in any sense the physical body which we now possess;* it is a new body, a different body, a spirit-body. Indeed, the insistence of the larger part of the chapter is not on rebuking the skepticism, but on correcting the error which led to the skepticism. As a matter of fact, the chapter rebukes and contradicts the presentation of the gospels more forcibly than it does the errors in Corinth.

What, then, in detail, does Paul urge? His main point is that there is a misapprehension as to what is meant by the *body* of the resurrection, the same misapprehension which has remained the fundamental error to this day. The resurrection body is not the buried body. Thou foolish one, says the plain-spoken apostle, every seed you sow tells you that there is a diversity of bodies. The bare kernel that you put into the ground bears no resemblance to the fair green plant that rises in its place. It must cease to be, must die, decay, and vanish utterly away, ere the new body rises; in other words, the life-germ which inhabits the body of the seed-kernel must sever itself

from that body, leave that body to subsequent decay and dissolution, in order that it may re-embody itself in the green shoot. The new body, the growing of the plant, absolutely preclude any persistence or renewal of life in the seed-kernel.

Of course Paul's figure, like most figures, is not absolutely exact, and must not be pressed in pedantic fashion. The germinating shoot is actually contained in the seed-kernel, the botanist tells us, as an integral part of it, which is, of course, not at all Paul's idea of the relation of the soul to the buried body, or of the two bodies to one another. His point is simply the unlikeness of the young plant to the bare grain. The vegetative life which dwelt in the latter has been re-embodied in the former. The grain is resolved to dust; the plant grows fresh and fair. "Thou sowest not the body that shall be."

Therefore all interpretation of the passage that makes any use of the continuity which actually exists, as a fact of botanical science, between seed and new plant, all idea that Paul means that the spirit-body develops out of the flesh-body, as the plant out of the seed-germ, is simply turning the figure on its head, and proving with it the opposite of the apostle's intention. Its whole point for him is in the total dissimilarity and non-continuity between seed and plant; we may criticise his botany, but we ought to understand his meaning. Theodor Korff is absolutely in error here, when he formulates as Paul's meaning: "As in the seed is contained the basis for a new organism, the embryo or germ of a new plant, so the earthly human body conceals in itself the foundation or the germ of the resurrection-body. It

is therefore clear that Paul in I. Cor. xv: 36–38 teaches an organic connection between the earthly and the pneumatic corporeality." Korff goes on to speak of the absorption of the endosperm or albumen of the seed by the germ, "wie jede gute Naturgeschichte lehrt," as conditioning Paul's view that the new resurrection-body assimilated the flesh-body out of which it sprang.[1] But the *tertium comparationis* used by Korff—the development of the seed-germ—is absolutely unmentioned by Paul, who was not here concerned with facts which "jede gute Naturgeschichte lehrt," even if he knew them, but only with what met the eyes, which saw a hard brown kernel, and then a fresh green plant.

The figure, for practical purposes, is clear enough, but Paul goes farther, and at great length, by examples from the vegetable and animal world, from the sun, moon, and stars, illustrates the manifold diversity of bodies. All this serves to show that "body" need not always mean the same thing, and illuminates his main point, that the body with which the dead "come" in the resurrection is absolutely of another sort from that put into the grave, in no wise continuous with it, in no wise a reviving or rehabilitation of it.

To make assurance doubly sure, verses 42–44 say this emphatically and in the clearest of language. The verbs "it is sown" (σπείρεται) and "it is raised" (ἐγείρεται) are impersonal; there is no antecedent subject corresponding to the *it* of the English. The

[1] Korff, pp. 126 f. Schwartzkopff, p. 107, is also at fault here, and Haller, pp. 287 f., is not wholly clear. Paul is not thinking of any "Beziehung zwischen beiden Leibern." Clearer here is Staudt, pp. 22 and 27. *Cf.* also Teichmann, pp. 45 f.

force is rather: To that which is sown belong corruption, dishonour, weakness; to that which rises, incorruption, glory, power. There is sown a natural body; there is raised a spiritual body.

The assumed identity of the one *it* with the other actually misleads many an English reader and expounder to an assumption of identity between the two predicate nouns which follow. The grammatical translation: a natural body is sown, a spiritual body is raised, would have made this error less easy. Paul is not speaking of one and the same body, which at an earlier period is corruptible and "psychic," but becomes at a later period incorruptible and spiritual. He is speaking of two distinct bodies. One is natural, earthy, the kind of body endowed with ψυχή and animal life which Adam transmits to all his posterity. The other is a spirit-body of glory, undecaying and strong, transmitted from the exalted Messiah, the first of men to assume it, as Adam was the first to assume the natural body. An earthly progenitor gave us an earthly body; his image we have all reproduced. A heavenly man, the founder and beginner of a new spiritual race, is to give us in turn his kind of body, a glorious spirit-body. So shall we reproduce his image.

We shall be changed from one image to the other; our earthly body shall not be transformed, but discarded. The body which we received from Adam is a fundamental part of that "old man" which we put off, with all that pertains to it, its passions and lusts, its bondage to law, its subjection to death. This is a great "Pauline thought"; it appears in the apostle's anthropology as in his theology, and is written large

in all his letters. So notably in the great passage Romans v: 12–vi: 11. So also Rom. viii: 10 f.; II. Cor. v: 14–17. To that old Adam-man, Adam-body, belong the external differences of sex, of race, of social status; all these differences are inherent in the Adam-body, and are put off with it. So Col. iii: 9–11; Phil. iii: 3–11 (very significant here); Gal. iii: 27 f. and *passim*. A renewal or persistence of that old body, however made over, would be fatal to this entire scheme of thought. The flesh-and-blood body, already in principle abandoned, will at death be wholly discarded. It will go its way to dust in the grave; the spiritual body is indifferent to it.[1]

Verse 50 makes this statement even more explicit, with its emphatic reiteration that flesh and blood, corruptible as they are, can have no inheritance in the new life. This verse is very conclusive, in its definite statement that the physical body is not to be the subject of the change, is not to inherit the qualities which distinguish the body of the new life. The continuity is broken; the spirit-body is a new creation, heavenly, not earthly, in its origin, and even now awaiting us above, a dwelling not made with hands, a building of God, eternal, a habitation which is from heaven, which shall *come down upon us*, not rise out of the

[1] This is well put by Teichmann, pp. 32 f.: "It is obvious that the more emphasis is laid on the opposition between σάρξ and πνεῦμα, the more to be desired becomes the annihilation of the σῶμα, as the form of the σάρξ. This body, which consisted of σάρξ, might go its way into destruction; it needed not to be preserved against the day of the parousia. For God would then give man, who, freed from σάρξ, now consisted only of πνεῦμα, a new σῶμα, a new form."

grave with us (II. Cor. v: 1 f.). Words could scarcely make clearer the statement that this eternal, God-made spirit-body of the heavenly life-to-be is not, in any sense whatever, a transforming or transfiguring of the body we have borne since birth, the body we leave to the grave at death.

But what of those who are alive at the parousia, who have not laid aside the old bodies? Here indeed is a "mystery," which the human mind could not know except it were revealed from God through the spirit. We who do not fall asleep shall be changed. The Greek word (ἀλλαγησόμεθα) does not signify *alter, transform*, so that the meaning here would be: our present bodies shall be refashioned and take on new qualities. Rather, we shall be *exchanged.* Our present bodies shall be destroyed, done away with; for the slow process of decay shall be substituted an instantaneous annihilation, and we shall assume a body, a σῶμα, that is ἄλλο, numerically and qualitatively another. Perhaps "instantaneous annihilation" says too much; Paul is really not concerned, here or elsewhere, to say what becomes of the fleshly body under these circumstances. What he does say is: we leave it, like a cast-off garment, and assume another body, deathless and undecaying. We go over from one to the other; we do not simply stay in the one while *it* undergoes a change. So much ἀλλαγησόμεθα, twice-repeated, clearly says.

Here also Paul evinces himself a thorough Jew in the fundamental concepts which shape his thinking. The Pharisaic view was that the soul, severing entirely its connection with the physical corruptible body, passed into a different body (μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον

σῶμα).[1] Certain Talmudic utterances, indeed, express the thought that the old body shall in some way be made again the habitation of the soul, and, less certainly, a few apocalyptic passages present this conception.[2] In Volz's admirable presentation of the material bearing on this point, the differing anthropological bases, and the differing religious needs to be met, on which the opposing views rest, are excellently brought out. The idea of the revival of the buried body is the popular, coarser view, and prevails chiefly in the rabbinic theology. The expectation of a new body, of more ethereal stuff, develops in the finer, more advanced minds, and is most dominant in the apocalyptic and the broader philosophy. Its presupposition is the spiritual anthropology, which regards the spiritual (pneumatic) element as the essential thing in man, and as something independent of the material. The other view presupposes the material anthropology, which makes the physical body the essential thing, and the chief condition of man's existence. This view meets the common unreflecting demand for the continuance of the present personal identity; the spiritual view expresses the longing for purity and divine perfection.

This analysis of the motives behind the two views

[1] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii., 163. So Josephus expresses his own conviction, iii., 374. *Cf.* on this point Wm. Weber, in *The Monist*, vol. xi., pp. 390 f. This article of Weber's gives an excellent popular account of Jewish, Greek, and Roman ideas concerning "life after death," especially concerning the conceptions of Hades and Sheol. The account in Korff, pp. 208-221, is confused and inaccurate.

[2] Volz, pp. 252-255.

as they were held by Jews of nearly a score of centuries ago, is, *ceteris paribus*, perfectly valid for the views as held substantially in the same form to-day. One has only seriously to inquire what lies in the minds of the unreflecting masses of people when they declare, "I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body." At any rate, one cannot be in doubt as to which anthropology was Paul's. Any of his epistles, most notably Romans, will tell us that τὸ πνευματικόν, not τὸ ψυχικόν, still less τὸ σωματικόν or τὸ σαρκικόν, is the highest and truest and most permanent element in man.[1]

Special emphasis is laid by Charles, Thackeray, and Lake on a passage in the first-century (roughly contemporary with Paul) Pharisaic *Apocalypse of Baruch*, chapters xlix. to li.[2] Here the dead are restored by the earth, "making no change in their form," because it is "necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again." The identification being satisfactorily made, the righteous undergo a change into another form, "that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die. . . . They shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory."

This passage is with right cited as in some sense

[1] This is also, of course, the view of Jesus. *Cf.* Weizsäcker, p. 13. Haller, pp. 283 f., is too sweeping in his generalisation as to Jewish belief in bodily resurrection.

[2] Charles, pp. 280 ff.; Thackeray, pp. 114 ff.; Lake, pp. 24 ff. The passage will be found in Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 1896, pp. 81-85. Wernle, p. 206, thinks it "probable" that Paul's view was substantially that of Baruch.

analogous to the statement of Paul, but it is not valid reasoning to interpret Baruch as meaning a resurrection of the buried body, later to be transfigured, and then to argue from this premise that for Paul "the Resurrection implied that the old material body was *changed* into a new spiritual one, not that it was, as it were, left behind."[1] It is not necessary that in all points Paul must agree with Baruch, because there is analogy in certain details; it is, moreover, far from certain that Baruch implies a resurrection of the physical body, and its change. He speaks only of rising in the old *form*, and the change comes over the aspect or form of the righteous. *They themselves* are transformed and made glorious, not the bodies of their earthly life. At any rate, this passage cannot be made to prove Paul's belief that resurrection concerns the earthly body, in the face of his own clear statements to the contrary.

Lake argues that Paul and Baruch alike predicate the actual rising of the buried physical body, as Luke holds in his gospel account, and that all alike hold this revived body to be sublimated and transformed later into the spiritual body. The only difference between them, Professor Lake thinks, is that Paul regards this transformation as immediately consequent on the resurrection, while Baruch and Luke put it after an interval, the latter, in the case of Jesus, putting it at the ascension, perhaps forty days after resurrection.[2]

This is to press out of Paul's words a meaning they will not bear, and to make his figure of the germinating seed the most unfortunate in the world. For the

[1] Lake, p. 27.

[2] Lake, p. 234; *cf.* also pp. 21-23.

tertium comparationis on which he lays his stress is the decaying of the seed-grain in the earth, and the entire distinctness of the young plant which comes out of the ground, from that grain. When Paul is asked: With what body do they come? his answer would have been quick and ready had he believed they would come with the physical body, even if "changed." Jesus' resurrection-body had "appeared" to many of his followers; why does Paul not refer to that, if it were the material body which the gospels represent it to have been? If one such new body had actually been present among men on earth, walking and talking, eating and drinking, taking particular pains to demonstrate its characteristics, declaring itself flesh and bone, bearing the marks of its death-wounds, demanding the tangible testing of these attributes by skeptical beholders—why does Paul pass all this by, and resort to analogies from the world of nature which really prove an opposite conclusion?

The matter of the exact time of the "change" in the properties of the body is not so important as Lake makes it; the important thing is to be sure *what*, in Paul's view, *is the thing that rises*. If he holds that the buried body comes from the grave, then he can easily believe with "Luke," that it retains some, at least, of its material qualities for a period of days or weeks.[1] The real question is, in brief: Does Paul's

[1] That Paul did so believe is argued by Otto Schmoller, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1894, p. 670. Here Paul is said to mean by Jesus' resurrection an occurrence which was concerned "mit dem Leibe Jesu nach seinem Todgeschehen, genauer ein nicht im Grab bleiben, sondern wieder Lebendigwerden desselben." The whole passage (pp. 669–693) deserves notice for its energetic presentation of this view.

view necessitate the empty grave, in the case of Jesus or in that of the Christians who shall rise at the parousia? This question a careful exegesis of Paul's words seems to answer with an unqualified negative.

It must in justice be added, however, that Paul no doubt gave to the Corinthians some ground for misapprehension, by an ambiguous use of the term σῶμα, body. He cannot think of *life* without a body; life means the activity of an embodied spirit. The existence of spirits during the period between death and resurrection is, in his terminology, a state of death; these spirits are "the dead," οἱ νεκρόι, out from among whom Jesus rises, and who themselves, so far as they are Christians, shall be raised to a new life, *i.e.*, to a new body. The others shall remain dead; their further fate is not intimated. But those who attain resurrection shall live in the body.

So Paul would say, and the phrase might easily lead to misconception. A more accurate expression of his thought would be: they shall live in a *re-clothed body*. For σῶμα, though Paul, of course, often used it loosely, as we do, for the physical body of flesh we now wear, meant for him, when strictly used, something different. It meant that outline form which distinguishes the individual from every other individual, in which inheres, therefore, the personality. "Body," in this sense, is the organism which is each man's real self, in which lies the continuity which makes his immortality. In form—for it is essentially form, not substance—it includes only the outward man, that which meets the eye; it has no inward parts or organs.[1]

[1] This meaning of σῶμα is roughly equivalent to what is meant by "soul," in many accounts of primitive animistic beliefs. *Cf.*

In the present world this body is clothed with flesh and bone and blood, literally incarnated; in the next world, having laid aside the fleshly garment, the Christian's body shall be clothed with spirit-stuff. The body is the same; the difference is in the material which the σῶμα takes to itself and to which it gives shape. Just so an artist's outline figure might be covered with clay, then the clay removed and the form reclothed with wax. The appearance is the same, the material is another. So in the spirit-body men shall be recognised, shall resemble their former selves, for the old body is there, to which the new clothing conforms as perfectly as did the old. When Jesus "appeared" to Peter, to James, they knew him; the old face and hair and eyes, the old form, were there. So this conception of "body" lies, consciously or unconsciously, behind all descriptions of "ghosts" in all times; the departed are recognised by those who have known them, as bearing the same external form and limbs and features, only moulded in some new ethereal transcendental substance.[1]

In Paul's common parlance, as in ours, "body" is the body as it is now clothed in σάρξ, hence it is the

E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, American Ed., 1874, chapters 11 and 12. The "astral body" of the theosophists may perhaps offer a helpful analogy. More precisely analogous is the corporeal soul argued for by Tertullian in his treatise *De Anima*: *Cf.* especially the description of a soul seen in vision by a Montanist sister (ch. 9). "A soul in bodily shape . . . such as would offer itself to be even grasped by the hand, soft and transparent, and of an ethereal colour, and *in form resembling that of a human being in every respect.*" Trans. by Peter Holmes, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American Ed., vol. iii., 1885, p. 188.

[1] *Cf.* Tylor, *loc. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 450, 455–457; vol. ii., p. 19.

seat of sin, weakness, corruption. As used in relation to the resurrection-life, "body" is the same organism clothed in πνεῦμα, the seat of goodness, power, incorruption. "Hence between the bodies there is no exact continuity. The existence of the one depends on the death of the other. Nevertheless some essential likeness exists between them. This essential likeness proceeds from the fact that they are successive expressions of the same personality, though in different spheres. It is the same individual vital principle that organises both."[1] What Professor Charles here means by "individual vital principle," Paul means by σῶμα, strictly used.

According to Moulton and Geden's Concordance, Paul uses the word σῶμα in seventy-five separate passages.[2] Of these, forty-one, or more than half, are in I. Corinthians, the word itself occurring forty-six times. Romans has it in thirteen passages, II. Corinthians in nine, Colossians in eight, Philippians in two, Galatians and I. Thessalonians in one each. For its specific meaning, Phil. iii: 11 is illuminating: "Who shall refashion (μετασχηματίσει) the σῶμα of our humiliation conformable (σύμμορφον) to the σῶμα of his glory." Our body, now in a humiliating dress of flesh, shall put off the accident of its external

[1] Charles, p. 394.

[2] The word itself occurs a somewhat larger number of times, being sometimes used more than once in the same sentence. These seventy-five passages are found in I. Thess., Gal., I. and II. Cor., Rom., Col., and Philippians. The word not unnaturally fails in Philemon. In the pseudo-Pauline II. Thess. and Pastorals it does not occur at all, but in Eph., also pseudo-Pauline, it occurs nine times, chiefly in passages modelled on Colossians.

σχῆμα and assume a form, a μόρφη, like the body of glory worn by Messiah in heaven.[1]

The discussion in I. Cor. vi: 12–20, on the enormity of fornication, has its whole point in this conception of σῶμα. The "body" which is here to be kept pure and holy for the Lord whose own it is, which is the temple of the most holy Spirit, is not the fleshly body of sin which is to be done away, but an enduring entity which the Lord shall claim at his coming. God raised up the Lord in his body, and shall raise us in ours. Our body and his put on alike, after resurrection, the clothing of spirit; one spirit, one substance, for our relation to him is as the relation of wife to husband on earth, who are one flesh. This "body" has the outer form, but not the inner organs, of the fleshly body we know; it is, as it were, a hollow shell, having only those parts which meet the eye. The belly is no part of it; the sexual members, on the contrary, are a part. Sins of gluttony, drunkenness, and the like do not affect the "body"; fornication directly concerns it, and prostitutes what is consecrated to the Lord.[2]

[1] *Cf.* J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 1888, pp. 130 f., and Marvin R. Vincent, *Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*, 1897, p. 120 f. J. Weiss, *Christus*, 1909, p. 54, makes the illuminating observation that the process undergone by the believer in Phil. iii: 11 is the precise opposite of that undergone by Christ Jesus in Phil. ii: 6.

[2] There is of course no real connection between Paul's thought and that of Jerome, in his *Liber Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*. In the resurrection, says Jerome, men "habent dentes, ventrem, genitalia, et tamen nec cibis nec uxoribus indigent." (Migne, vol. xxiii., p. 585.) Jerome does what Paul fails to do, and proves his point by reference to Jesus' risen body. "Noli poten-

So in I. Thess. v: 23 Paul prays that sanctification may be complete, that πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα may be kept and found blameless at the Lord's parousia. The body must be kept pure in readiness to be claimed by the Lord. This is also the real sense of I. Thess. iv: 2–8; fornication must be avoided on precisely the same ground as is urged in I. Cor. vi; it defiles what belongs to Christ, the enduring σῶμα, the real man.[1]

Perhaps Paul's conception of the true body and its successive clothing comes out most clearly in the passage II. Cor. v: 1–10. This much-discussed passage, which many commentators[2] describe as pre-

---

tiam Domini magorum præstigiis adæquare, ut videatur fuisse quod non fuit, et putetur comedisse sine dentibus, ambulasse sine pedibus, fregisse panem sine manibus, locutus esse sine lingua, et latus monstrasse sine costis." (Migne, p. 587.) The passages ought to be read in their context, and may be found, in excellent English translation, in the *Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. vi., 1893, pp. 440-442.

[1] For a careful and complete presentation of this notion of σῶμα in Pauline usage, *cf.* Holsten, Die bedeutung des wortes Σάρξ im lehrbegriffe des Paulus (in Zum Evang. d. Paulus u. d. Petrus, 1868), pp. 376-378. "An dem begriffe der *form* aber hat [σῶμα] seine qualitative bestimmtheit." *Cf.* also Schmiedel (in Holtzmann's Hand-Commentar, ii: 1, 2d Ed., 1892), excursus *ad* I. Cor. vi: 20. For the view of I. Thess. v: 23 presented above, *cf.* Schmiedel's comment *ad loc.* in the same volume.

Similarly J. Weiss, *Christus*, 1909, p. 51, defines "body," as Paul uses the term, as "eine festumrissene Persönlichkeitsform, wir würden sagen: eine 'Gestalt' (dies wohl die beste Übersetzung von Soma)." *Cf.* A. P. Stanley, *Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 3d Ed., 1865, p. 314 (*ad* xv: 35). "The corresponding modern notions would be better conveyed, not by the word 'body,' but 'organisation' or 'framework.'"

[2] Charles, p. 400; Thackeray, pp. 128 ff.; Teichmann, pp. 65-67; Schmiedel (Hand-Commentar, ii: 1, 2d Ed., 1892), pp. 236-241;

senting a developed or altered view of the resurrection from that in I. Cor. xv, is really in perfect harmony with the latter. Paul is here not longing for a death which should usher him at once into "heaven" and the presence of his Master, as is frequently stated. He groans and longs for the possession of the new spiritual body, but there is nothing that indicates his expectation of possessing it before the parousia. What he longs for is precisely the "change" of I. Cor. xv: 52 f. Our modern chapter-division is misleading. The whole context, iv: 7 to v: 10 must be taken together. The apostle recounts his physical hardships and weaknesses, which are wearing away his fleshly body in which, as he goes about, he bears continually this process of νέκρωσις, a "putting to death" like that of his Master.[1] And as his physical form decays, his spiritual life, a life like that of his glorified Master, comes more and more into evidence. The way to the perfect realisation of the spiritual life lies through the entire putting off of the fleshly σῶμα, either through death or through the "change" at the parousia. Paul still expects, not death, but the "change" while yet alive. And yet if death should come, the interim of "sleeping" would be a period of rest, and so brief that it would have no real terrors for him; he would look over and beyond it to the day of resurrection. His faith is perfect, his assurance unshakable.

Wherefore he faints not; unmoved he sees his out-

Orello Cone, in *The New World*, June, 1895, pp. 297 f.; H. J. Holtzmann, *N. T. Theol.*, vol. ii., p. 193; Oskar Holtzmann, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, 2d Ed., 1906, p. 386; and others.

[1] Holsten, p. 69, note * * * reads too much out of this word.

ward fleshly man decay, while his spiritual life is ever renewed by communion with its Lord, as it draws nearer its day of realisation. On that day and its glories his eye is fixed. Rejoicing in the promise of the spirit-body, he cares not what fate overtakes the fleshly body. Its dissolution is a matter of indifference to him; he has laid up for him, above, a house of divine workmanship, eternal, glorious.

Here we have the clearest possible distinction between the two bodies, between the "earthly house" and the "building from God." One decays, the other is divinely prepared in anticipation of the coming occupant.[1] That the "habitation which is from heaven" is a making over of the "earthly house," as is commonly urged, is an idea absolutely impossible to this context. The one point of connection between them is the identity of the occupant.

How Paul longs for the day when he may take up his abode in the heavenly house, not least because

[1] *Cf.* the Ascension of Isaiah iv:16 f. (Charles's Ed., 1900, p. 34). "The saints will come with the Lord with their garments which are (now) stored up on high in the seventh heaven; with the Lord they will come, whose spirits are clothed, they will descend and be present in the world, and He will strengthen those who have been found in the body, together with the saints, in the garments of the saints, and the Lord will minister to those who have kept watch in this world. And afterwards they will turn themselves upward in their garments, and their body will be left in the world."

Charles is probably right in conjecturing that the Ethiopic verb translated "He will strengthen" goes back to a corruption of the original Greek wording (not extant) "he will clothe"; for example, *ἐνισχύσει* for *ἐνδύσει*. *Cf.* also ix: 7–9 (Charles, p. 60). "And there I saw all the righteous . . . stript of the garments of the flesh, and I saw them in their garments of the upper world and they were like angels, standing there in great glory."

it means being rid forever of the house of weakness, pain, error, sin, which has for so many weary years been the dwelling of his spirit! He groans in his longing; it is weary waiting. He groans, indeed, not simply to put off the present garb (changing the figure), not simply to be naked and unclothed, because the garment of flesh is grievous to his spirit. No, that state of naked disembodiment, though it be a sleep, has no attraction for Paul; far rather would he battle on in weakness and hardship until the end. But that end itself, with its new body and its endless life, with its farewell to weakness, corruption, mortality, *that* he longs for with eager desire. Not unclothing, but reclothing; and that which is to put on the new vesture is the essential σῶμα. There is here nowhere any indication that Paul expects this reclothing before the time. He *wishes* it were his; he knows it cannot be, until the parousia. Yet is he not cast down; he is content to wait, because of his absolute assurance, because of the pledge (ἀρραβών) which God has given him in the Spirit.

He is, then, of good courage in his present lot, enduring his temporary absence from the Master without complaint, though his personal desire is strongly for the call to take leave of the physical body and to enter the Master's intimate presence. He longs, in brief, for the parousia.[1] But meantime

[1] So Kennedy, p. 266, Staudt, p. 22, and, in substance, R. Kabisch: *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, 1893, pp. 299 f., and C. F. G. Heinrici, *Das Zweite Sendschreiben d. Apostel Paulus an d. Korinthier*, 1887, p. 256. Similarly, though not in entire agreement, Wernle, pp. 207 f. *Cf.* further Meyer–Haupt *ad* Phil. iii: 10 (1902, pp. 135 f.) and Bousset *ad* 2 Cor. v: 1–5 (in *Schriften des N. T.*).

it is his aim to be well pleasing to the Master, now in his absence as he shall be in that blessed time when he shall live continually in the Presence. For as one uses this present body, when one's home is in it, for divine purposes or for selfish lusts, so shall one's lot be determined in that day when we shall all face the judgment of Messiah. Only those whose life in the σῶμα σαρκικόν has been worthy shall receive the σῶμα πνευματικόν.

The same mood and thought come to expression in Phil. i: 20–24. Again the hardships of life in the flesh press upon him, and the longing for the new life cannot be suppressed. Imprisonment, persecution, the spite of false brethren, all conspire to make him weary of the struggle. Confident of his own rectitude, he knows that neither death nor life can put him to shame. Living, he magnifies his Master's name and influence; dying, he dies as witness to his Master's grace. Death for Christ is already becoming a μαρτυρία in a new and powerful sense. For himself he would welcome death; it is rest and it is the pathway to the new life. The parousia cannot now be long delayed. Shall Paul remain here to work under ever-increasing difficulties, or shall he depart? If to continue life in the flesh means fruit from the work which he might do (for to live is to go on preaching), then he will not declare his personal preference.[1]

He is beset by contrary claims, his longing to "break up camp" (ἀναλῦσαι) and give over his warfare, which were indeed gain to him, and his desire to prolong his missionary activity and so win more

[1] γνωρίζω here, as always in the N. T., has the sense of tell, make known. *Cf.* Vincent *ad loc.*

fruit for his Master. The former were very far better for him; the latter is more needful for the men he may help. And here, as always, Paul subordinates every thought of personal preference to the one supreme purpose of gaining men for Christ. Gladly will he stay; gladly, indeed, would he consent to have the parousia and his release deferred yet a little longer, if that be God's will, that by all means he may save some.

It is a mistake to read into these brave words of a weary and broken man any systematic declaration of eschatological doctrine, or to assume that the phrase "desire to depart and to be with Christ" implies that the apostle had changed his views of the fate of those dying before the parousia, and now believed that such death meant immediate resurrection to the heavenly life. As Wernle well puts it, "the man who wrote the great resurrection chapter in I. Corinthians did not possess a modern theologian's capability of changing his opinions; the hope to which he there gives expression is for him truth for which he is ready to live and to die."[1] In his Roman prison, as amidst the fightings and fears out of which he wrote his "reconciliation-letter" to Corinth, Paul longs for the Renewal and the perfect life, and it is only pedantry that asks him to weigh his words so that future exegetes will find them all consistent parts of his "system."

"He only sees the earthly life, on the one hand, and Christ, in whom his life is hid, on the other. What may happen between cannot interfere with

[1] Wernle, p. 207.

his glowing conviction that his salvation is independent of death."[1] To be absent from the body means —passing over the brief interval before the parousia— to be at home with the Master; to depart is to take the first step toward being with Christ. It is altogether mistaken when Teichmann declares, "The resurrection of the Christians is by II. Cor. v. rendered not only unnecessary, but wholly impossible."[2] We must not forget that the Paul who wrote II. Cor. v. and Phil. i. wrote also Phil. iii: 10–21. He is the Paul who in the latter passage craves as a prize fellowship with Christ's sufferings and conformity to his death, that out of his death he may attain to resurrection, the Paul who is waiting for the coming from heaven of a saviour, who shall refashion his body of humiliation into his own glorious likeness. Resurrection and parousia are too clearly present in the apostle's thought here to have been rejected by his thought in the earlier lines of the same letter.

The more specific conception of "body" is found in numerous other passages of Paul's letters. So plainly in Rom. viii: 23; the σῶμα is to be redeemed by putting off flesh and assuming spirit. In Rom. xii: 1, also, the bodies which are to be presented to God as a living sacrifice are not the "bodies of sin," but the enduring bodies, which are not to be fashioned to this age (μὴ συνσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ), but transformed by a renewal of the disposition over into a new mode of existence (μεταμορφοῦσθε). The language is that of Phil. iii: 20 f., and the thought

[1] Kennedy, p. 272.

[2] Teichmann, p. 67. Thackeray, p. 133, rightly says, "These statements are quite unwarranted by St. Paul's language."

is the same. So in I. Cor. vi: 19 f. the σῶμα that is a shrine of the Holy Spirit, the σῶμα in which God is to be glorified, as a divinity is worshipped in his temple, is not the physical body of sin, but the body which is for the Lord, as throughout this chapter.

It may be granted that Paul's language is not always guardedly consistent, free from ambiguity, as indeed is the language of no living man, least of all that of an active propagandist and preacher like Paul, whose writings are the rapid occasional utterances which the varying stress of the moment provokes. Sometimes that which experiences resurrection and is endowed with the garment of spirit is called by the apostle σῶμα, in the strict sense; sometimes it is "we," the persons, the selves. In either case the idea is the same, for in the σῶμα inheres the personality, the continuity of identity.[1] But the one clear conclusion from all his utterances is that in the process of resurrection and what follows it, the physical body plays no part whatever. It does not rise, it is not changed, every grave still holds the flesh and blood that was committed to it, when resurrection is already an accomplished fact.

The question raised by the Corinthian skeptics was concerning the reality of resurrection for themselves and their fellow-Christians; it included no doubt that Jesus had been raised. And Paul's whole discussion has been a demonstration of the resurrection

[1] *Cf.* Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, 47. (Quoted by Tylor, vol. i., p. 450.)

"Eternal form shall still divide
The eternal soul from all beside;
And I shall know him when we meet."

of Christians in general, taking the resurrection of Jesus as a fixed premise from which to argue. But any treatment of the resurrection of Jesus must necessarily take into account this discussion of Paul's, not only verses 3 to 8, in which the rising and subsequent appearances of Jesus are cited, but the whole chapter. In brief, all writers on the resurrection of Jesus recognise, though not all clearly express it or consistently apply it, that whatever Paul says concerning the resurrection of any Christian man is valid also for the resurrection of Jesus, save only the element of date. In his thought there was only one kind of resurrection, only one experience which could bear that name, and through this process Jesus had already passed, as his followers should pass on the near day of their Master's coming.

If we ask, then, just how Paul conceived Jesus' resurrection, we have already the answer to that question. Jesus in death laid aside the σῶμα σαρκικόν and, after an interval of hours, during which he (or his "self" or σῶμα in the strict sense) existed "naked" in the lower world among οἱ νεκρόι, he was raised ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν into the heavenlies and endowed with his new σῶμα πνευματικόν. His followers' fellowship with him henceforth is with a living man, not with the memory of a dead leader. Negatively, it is absolutely clear that Paul not only did not hold the view that Jesus' resurrection concerned his buried body and necessitated an empty grave, but that he protests strongly against any supposition that might lead to such a view.[1] That view is precisely the thing which

[1] *Cf.* A. Kalthoff, *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1904, p. 14. "Die Frage, ob es sich bei der Auferstehung um die Wiederbele-

his whole discussion is concerned to combat. That this has not been clear to every student is simply another tribute to the influence of the precedence of the gospel stories, both in order and in emphasis.

Apparently the precise thought of Paul, as expressed in this great fifteenth chapter, was not clearly apprehended in Corinth. He convinced the doubters, indeed, but not of the exact conception for which he argued. He caused them to believe what they had hitherto been unable to believe, the resurrection of the body, but "body" for them continued to imply in this connection something other than it implied for Paul. Paul's thought never succeeded in becoming the common possession of the early church; if it had, we should not have the gospel stories in their present form. If it had, these stories would give no account at all of anything connected with the grave and the buried body, nothing of doings of the dead Jesus, but would chronicle only experiences of his followers. They would but fill in the details of Paul's brief word, "he appeared" to Cephas and the rest. They would approximate more nearly to the account in Acts of the "appearance" to Paul, with visual and perhaps auditory phenomena, but with no ascription of physical characteristics to the Risen One.[1] Our gospel stories are the product of the error of the

---

bung eines Scheintoten, oder um das reelle Lebendigwerden eines Gestorbenen handelt, für die Epistel literatur gar nicht in Betracht kommen [kann]."

[1] *Cf.* Holsten, p. 34. For the reason noted above, such a relation of Luke's resurrection-narrative to Paul's as H. J. Holtzmann once assumed (*Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863, p. 396) is quite the reverse of the reality.

ἄφρονες in Corinth, an error which proved so widespread and deeply-rooted that even the ardent and definite declarations of the apostle were unable to uproot it, or to prevent it from becoming the orthodoxy of twenty centuries.

Now it is granted, indeed, by a very considerable number of critical scholars that Paul did not think of Jesus' resurrection as the revival of his corpse, after the fashion of the gospel narratives. But by certain of these scholars it is urged that Paul none the less believed that the change was wrought *upon* the corpse, that when the σῶμα πνευματικόν appeared, the σῶμα σαρκικόν disappeared, sublimated, as it were, and swallowed up by the "clothing upon" of the new organism.[1] The object upon which the change is wrought, that is, is the σῶμα σαρκικόν, not the σῶμα as such, stripped of σάρξ, naked and indifferent to its abandoned vesture. In short, it is urged that Paul's view, no less than that of the gospels, necessitates the empty grave.

As Beyschlag declares, "Paul emphasises the burial of Jesus and thereby explains Jesus' resurrection as being a going forth from the grave,"[2] so also even Schmiedel, though convinced that Paul knew nothing of the (unhistorical) story of the finding of the empty tomb, yet asserts, "That Jesus was buried and that 'he

[1] So, *e. g.*, Haller, p. 290; Steude, p. 19; B. W. Bacon, in *Am. Jour. Theol.*, 1902, p. 257.

[2] Beyschlag, p. 447. Beyschlag, of course, makes Paul in close agreement with the gospel presentation. It is difficult to find in *καὶ ἐτάφη* the "Betonung" that for Beyschlag is "von grösster Bedeutung." The same "Betonung" is found by Voigt, p. 143, note 1.

has been raised' (I. Cor. xv: 4) cannot be affirmed by any one who has not the reanimation of the body in mind."[1] Paul, as a Jew of his time, thinks Schmiedel, must have believed that the body of the new life was a transformation of the body of the old life, which must come out of the grave for that purpose. Schmiedel finds the view which Paul must have held in Matt. xxvii: 52, "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised, and coming forth out of the tombs, after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many." It is difficult to believe that even for "Matthew" what happened to these saints was actually their "resurrection" and entrance into the new life; it is impossible to believe that Paul conceived the process in such coarse fashion.[2]

Schmiedel finds the same idea,[3] of the revived corpse as in substance the resurrection-body, in certain passages of Josephus—*Antiquities*, xviii., 1: 3 and *Jewish War*, iii., 8: 5—passages which on examination seem to say anything but this. Even if Schmiedel's

[1] Schmiedel, col. 4059. Similarly Korff, p. 138 and pp. 16 f. So Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 708, understands Paul as guaranteeing the empty grave. In *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1900, p. 102, he is less pronounced; "wahrscheinlich" instead of "unwidersprechlich." *Cf.* also *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 82 (English tr., vol. i., 1895 pp. 85 f.). Similarly, Schwartzkopf, pp. 105 f.; Voigt, p. 22; Vernon Bartlet, *Apostolic Age*, 1899, p. 4; S. J. Case, in *Am. Jour. Theol.*, April, 1909, p. 181; A. Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, 3d. ed., 1904, p. 120; J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, i., 1902, pp. 71 f., note. *Cf. infra*, pp. 225–228.

[2] It is surely to beg the question to cite, as Schmiedel does, Christian writings from the end of the century (Matt., Acts, Rev.) as evidence for Paul's view. That Paul held the view of "Matthew" and "Luke" is precisely the question at issue.

[3] Col. 4062.

exegesis of Josephus were correct, the equation: the Pharisees (as represented by Josephus here) equal Paul, would be unjustified. But we have already seen what the Pharisees and Josephus really held,[1] and have found that Paul could believe in the new body as entirely discontinuous in substance with the old, and be in perfect agreement with a very considerable part of the best Jewish thought of his time. Schmiedel's dictum that the spiritual body was not "given to Jesus at his resurrection as a new body whilst the old body remained in the grave, but . . . it came into existence through a change wrought on the buried body,"[2] is not demanded by the evidence of contemporary Jewish belief, and is opposed to all the direct evidence of Paul's own utterances. Von Soden has the more correct statement. "According to the Jewish notions concerning death and the transition into the eternal heavenly world, the grave need not at all be taken into consideration. Without the corpse leaving the grave, out of the life-germ contained in it, which passes with the soul into the underworld, the new heavenly organism may be shaped." For Paul also, "the way from the underworld into heaven does not lead through the grave."[3] So Pfleiderer, briefly and to the point. "Ausgeschlossen ist . . . jedwede Beziehung des [dem Paulus] so geoffenbarten himmlischen Lebens Christi zu dem ins Grab gelegten

[1] *Supra*, pp. 89 f. and Volz, as there cited.

[2] Col. 4076 f.

[3] H. von Soden, *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, 1904, p. 104. Von Soden's only uncertainty (and this a needless one) is whether *Jesus* would use for the transition into the heavenly world the term "resurrection," as Paul does.

Leib Jesu."[1] Finally, Martineau has the perfectly correct statement. "To Paul and his believers it would have made no difference if the Jewish authorities had rifled the tomb and publicly replaced the body upon the uplifted cross; this would no more prevent the spirit he had committed into the Father's hand from putting on its garment of heavenly light, than the contest between Michael and Satan for the body of Moses could detain the lawgiver from his welcome by the angels."[2]

Those who read so much out of Paul's καὶ ἐτάφη need to consider seriously whether, after all, Paul's whole faith, his whole *religion*, we might almost say, and the faith of Christianity for these twenty centuries, would have been impossible save for the chance clemency in Pilate which gave the body to Joseph for burial. Suppose Pilate had been in less complaisant mood, suppose the body had been unburied, left upon the cross, a prey to the elements and noisome birds. Or suppose Jesus, instead of being crucified, had been burned to ashes at the stake; suppose that he had been devoured by beasts in the arena, would Paul's faith, nay, Paul himself, as we know him, have then been impossible? *Would it then have been impossible for Jesus to rise from the dead?*[3]

That is precisely what is claimed by those who insist that the grave is a necessary element in the

[1] Pfleiderer, p. 5. Similarly Wernle, p. 127.

[2] Martineau, p. 370. The same point is excellently put by Holsten, pp. 125–134, especially p. 129.

[3] See this point briefly considered, without definite conclusion, by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. ii., 1908, p. 510, first column. Mr. Simpson urges that the empty tomb and the reanimated body have no essential connection with the resurrection as such, but were indispensable

resurrection-process, that resurrection may have no other definition than an issuance of the corpse (however changed) out of the tomb. If this is seriously to be held, then it ought to be consistently held, and the *burial* made a central point in the series of events on which the world's salvation depends, a *Hauptheilsmoment.*[1] It would then be little, if any,

---

as evidence to the crude minds of Palestinians of the first century. This is an advance on the point of view of the popular apologetic, though one might call in question the principle of the divine action presupposed.

[1] With as good right Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, iv., 26, urges the providential nature of Jesus' death by crucifixion, instead of by beheading, *e. g.*, so that his body might be left intact and in condition to be revived. *Cf.* Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, xxiv., 4.

To be sure, ταφέντα occurs in the original form of the Old Roman Symbol, but it has not the value of a separate article of faith, but only adds reality to the statement of crucifixion and death (σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα). It is worth recalling that the burial of Jesus is mentioned in the New Testament, aside from the gospel narratives, only six times, Mark xiv: 8 (=Matt. xxvi: 12); Rom. vi: 4 (=Col. ii: 12); I. Cor. xv: 4; Acts xiii: 29. Only the last two of these are statements of the fact. Two of the six are repetitions of other two; four of the six are attributed to Paul, though but two of them are really his. Prior to the last quarter of the second century only Aristides (*Apology*, ch. 2) and Justin (Dialogue, chs. 97 and 118) certainly mention it. It is mentioned also in three dubious Syriac fragments attributed to Melito of Sardis (*fl. ca.* 165), found in W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 52–56, and *A.N.F.*, American Ed., vol. viii., 1866, pp. 756–758. So far as the N. T. is concerned, only the gospel stories and Acts xiii: 29 f. (a reflection, of course, of the account in Luke xxiv.) bring the burial into relation with the resurrection. It is especially significant that Jesus, despite all his allusions to his expected rising, never couples with them any allusion to his burial or tomb.

inferior to the death of Jesus in necessary significance for human redemption. That this has not been, and cannot be, seriously urged, is sufficient evidence that for no believer has the grave of Jesus actually had the importance which is attached to it in treatises on the resurrection. Unconsciously the deeper conviction, even of the writers, has remained unpersuaded by the dialectic arguments of the mind.

It is one of the most curious things in the history of dogma that the grave and the physical body have been so strenuously insisted on as necessary moments in the very conception of "resurrection" as used of Jesus, while they have not entered at all into the definition of resurrection as expected for Jesus' followers. No one now fancies that it has the least bearing on his own resurrection whether his body is buried or burned or left to decay on the field of battle. Yet we are told, in effect, that lack of burial would have been absolutely prohibitive to resurrection in the case of Jesus. Why he was subject to this curious limitation from which every one of his followers is free, is not explained. From all such confusions and contradictions of thought Paul, at least, was free. For him it was true of Jesus, precisely as of all Christians, that when the earthly house of his tabernacle met dissolution, he received, not the same house again, made over, but a new dwelling, a building from God, not made with hands, a habitation eternal, ready in the heavens for his coming.[1]

[1] It would be much worth while to make a study, not alone of the New Testament doctrine of resurrection, but of the twentieth century Christian doctrine of it. What do the great masses of Christian preachers and Christian people actually believe to-

We must therefore dissent from the view of Schmiedel and Lake that for Paul and the earliest believers Jesus' resurrection necessitated the "sublimation" of his earthly body, or its disappearance from the grave, because from it, in some mysterious way, must be fashioned the new body of his spirit-life.[1] But we must agree with them on what is, after all, a much more important point, namely, that granting this conception as that of Paul, it does not in the least imply that the apostle believed or even knew any one of the gospel stories concerning the revived body. It does not guarantee in any degree Paul's belief that the women went to the grave, that the stone was rolled away, that the body came out; still less his belief in the earthquake, the angels, the walk to Emmaus, the eating and drinking, and the other episodes we read in our gospels.

To read belief in these things into Paul's statements is an act of purely arbitrary conjecture. To grant

---

day, not about immortality, but about resurrection? What does Dr. Orr actually believe? May the question be raised whether, after all, Christian people to-day believe in resurrection at all, in any real sense? It is easy to re-define the word so as to cover our own belief, whatever that be. But do we believe in resurrection, defined as Paul defined it, or has the Christian world given up Paul's belief as an error? Of whatever adjustment individual consciences are capable, it is historical falsehood to affirm: "I believe in the resurrection of the body," thereby meaning: "I believe in the immortality of the soul." *Cf.* J. Wendland, *Der Wunderglaube im Christentum*, 1910, p. 113.

[1] Holsten, p. 37, "muss gegen Beyschlag entschieden bestreiten, dass der auferstehungsleib des herrn für Paulus nicht ein *neues σῶμα ἐπουράνιον*, sondern der frühere, zu einer höheren, geistigen existenz-form verklärte irdische leib gewesen sei."

that he believed the appearance of the spiritual body necessitated the disappearance of the material body is only to say that he held, theoretically, that if Jesus' grave could be found and opened, there would be no body within. But this he would hold, granting that he held it at all, purely as a matter of theory, because his anthropological system demanded it. When he returned to Jerusalem as a Christian, eight or nine years after Jesus' death, it was of course too late to make inquiries about the corpse. But on no hypothesis whatever would Paul have the slightest reason to make inquiries concerning the body. On Schmiedel's hypothesis, his very seeing of Jesus precluded any such inquiry. If I meet my friend in New York, I do not cable to inquire whether he has yet left London. If I see a book on my desk, I do not search whether it be still on the shelf. On the view of Paul's belief here presented, it would not be of the slightest consequence whether Jesus' body were still in the grave; it would of course be assumed to be there, and would not be a subject of inquiring thought at all.

In the case of the brethren who have died in Thessalonica, Paul does not inquire whether their bodies have been burned to ashes, whether they were devoured by wild beasts or drowned in the sea. As little as their resurrection-to-be is conditioned on their dying in their beds and the usual interment of their bodies, so little was Jesus' resurrection conditioned by the disposition or fate of his body after the moment when his spirit left it.

CHAPTER IV

PAUL'S FURTHER WITNESS

WE have examined Paul's witness to the resurrection of Jesus, as written in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. We have tried to answer most of the questions raised by that chapter, and have come to a definite understanding as to the belief of the apostle to which the chapter witnesses. But it is possible that the evidence of this chapter, when taken alone, may be misleading. Elsewhere Paul may qualify it, or suggest points of view that will put certain parts of the testimony in a different light, or add elements that are here lacking. At any rate, in order to secure a clear and complete answer to the question: What did Paul believe about the resurrection? we must examine his other letters for utterances on the same theme. Of such further utterances we shall find no lack. In each of the genuine letters of Paul,[1] except Philemon, there is frequent reference to the resurrection, either of Jesus or of believers in Jesus, and we have already seen that resurrection means one thing for both, that what is said of Jesus' rising is valid for that of his followers, and *vice versa*. Some of these passages have already been touched

[1] II. Thess., Eph., and the Pastorals are not regarded as from Paul's pen.

upon; we may briefly examine the content of others. Any complete treatment of the resurrection as witnessed by Paul's letters would require an examination of practically the whole of each letter, so large does the conviction of the risen life loom in Paul's Christian consciousness. Yet the more definite utterances may here be noticed.

First Thessalonians, Paul's earliest letter to be kept in our canon, has in i: 10 a very simple, brief, and yet complete statement of his belief about resurrection. It is characteristic of the Christians that they "are waiting for his son [to come] from the skies, whom he raised out from among the dead, Jesus, who rescues us from the coming wrath." Here there is no hint of an intermediate tarrying of the risen Jesus on earth, such as that of "the forty days," but he is raised ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. All the moments of value are in this transition, and the interpolation of such episodes as the gospels give us at this point would only disturb the sense and confuse the real emphasis of the passage. Jesus was raised, as always in Paul's thought and expression, by God, by an act of the divine power, which is only a briefer statement of what is said in II. Cor. v: 1–10. God has made ready for his own a body in heaven, which he keeps against the dissolution of the earthly frame; then by his almighty power he raises the naked "soul" and "gives it a body, even as it pleases him, and to each a body of its own."

Further, the raising of Jesus is not here cited as a witness to his unique or superhuman nature; for Paul it is never that, it could not be that. The only thing which is unique about Jesus' resurrection is that it precedes all others in point of time. Otherwise it

witnesses, not to anything about Jesus, but to the power of God, to God's love and goodness in promising resurrection also to the followers of his son. In this assurance which it gives that the faithful shall in their turn rise from the dead, lies the chief ground of the mention of resurrection here. Jesus rose in order that from the heavens he might return in power to bring about for faithful men what God had wrought for him.[1] "I go to prepare a place for you; I come again and will receive you unto myself, that where I am, ye may be also."

Of course it will be at once objected, what we would not in the least deny, that Jesus' resurrection did have for Paul the other value, that it was for him the supreme, practically the one and only, proof of Jesus' divine mission and Messiahship. This is fundamental to all Paul's thought, as needs not to be said. Rom. i: 4 is the clear statement of it.[2] But none the less, it is not Jesus' rising *as such* that declares him the Son of God; it is his rising *on the third day*, his priority to all other men. At the last day

[1] So the latest commentator, George Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 1908, *ad loc.* For the same point of view of the resurrection as witnessing not primarily to Jesus' supremacy, but to the promise of future blessedness for the Christians, Milligan very justly cites Rom. viii: 11; I. Cor. xv: 20 ff.; II. Cor. iv: 14; Col. i: 18; Acts xvii: 31. He might have cited nearly every allusion of Paul to Jesus' resurrection, *e. g.*, I. Thess. iv: 14; Phil. iii: 10 f., 20 f., etc.

[2] But almost the only direct statement of it in Paul's letters. The other point of view is everywhere predominant. Acts commonly has the evidential conception of Rom. i: 4; so Acts ii: 24–36, iii: 15, x: 40 f., xiii: 33 f., xxvi: 33. Acts xvii: 31 also belongs here, though Milligan cites it for its bearing on parousia and judgment.

all the faithful rise; rising in itself conveys no distinction. Only as Jesus was singled out and removed from Hades speedily, ere yet his flesh saw corruption, only as he was given Messianic power upon his entrance into the heavenly world, given power to reveal himself to his followers on earth, power to commune with them and live in them, power to come again in glory and might, with all the holy angels, to set up the Kingdom—only so was he "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." Not his rising, but his rising *so*, proves him the Anointed One. These elements are of value as proofs, to persuade men to accept the gospel; but when men are once Christians, the resurrection of Jesus is for them primarily a great promise. "Because he lives, we shall live also."

Theologians have ever been of various minds as to the precise point of uniqueness in Jesus' resurrection, that differentiated it from all others.[1] On the one hand, its substantial identity with the resurrection awaiting us must be maintained, for here, as Paul was so keenly conscious, lie its values for us. On the other hand, an essential difference must also be maintained, or wherein shall Jesus' resurrection witness to a supernatural character in him which our resurrections shall in no wise demonstrate as belonging to us? Paul at least was not for a moment in doubt on this matter. Jesus is declared anointed Son of God in that he rose from the world of the dead (*a*) prior to all others, prior to the end of the age, almost immediately after death; (*b*) to be endowed

[1] *Cf.* Appendix.

in the heavenly world with all the powers, dignities, and attributes of Messiah, power to inspire men now, and to come in glory to establish the Kingdom of God; (*c*) by a direct act of the divine will, whereas all others shall be raised by virtue of their relation to him.

This last point needs to be stated a little more fully, as it is exceedingly important in Paul's thought, and is yet commonly overlooked. Paul expects resurrection only because he has established relations with the glorified Messiah; the power to rise is mediated only through that relationship.[1] How, then, did Jesus rise, for whom there was no Messiah? For him the active principle of resurrection is necessarily somewhat differently conceived: for him, as the *prius*, the first-born from the dead, there is a special, initiatory creative act of God's power. Here, too, he is the second Adam. All men are born of women; Adam was created by God. Our physical bodies are inheritances; our spiritual bodies are of God, not made with hands. Our natural lives, weak, sinful, under law, are inheritances; our spiritual lives are a new creation.

Here are two lines of development; at the head of each is a man created, not born. The first man, of the earthly line, became, by God's creative act, a living ψυχή; the second man, of the heavenly order, became, also by God's creative act, a life-giving πνεῦμα. After each comes the long line of posterity wherein each member is no longer a special creation, but inherits a derived life, consequent on his relation to the head. Resurrection, as Paul conceives it, is possible alone to those who have been transferred

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 72–75.

from the one line to the other. Such transference of relationship from the first Adam to the second Adam frees one absolutely from all the claims and contingencies of the first order—law, sin, death. There are Paul's theology and philosophy of religion in a sentence. Jesus' resurrection was the creative act of God by which he was established as the second Adam, as "the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col. i: 18).

Such, then, are the factors which, in Paul's faith, give to the resurrection of Jesus its pre-eminence and uniqueness. But though this unique aspect of the matter is clearly present to his mind, it is not the aspect on which he lays greatest emphasis, or to which, in writing to his churches, he most frequently calls attention. It is Jesus' resurrection as the "first-fruits," as the pledge and promise of that of his followers, which commonly comes to expression. So we found it in the verse which we were examining, I. Thess. i: 10. The last clause of that verse deserves a passing comment, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης. Jesus, by his resurrection and establishment as "head" of the new spiritual order, rescues the believers from the wrath which is coming, not by inducing God to spare them, nor by miraculously protecting them when the wrath comes, but simply by removing them from the field where the wrath shall be exercised.[1] By the simple transfer

[1] The present participle *ῥυόμενον* is not equivalent to *ῥυσόμενον*, "shall rescue us when the wrath comes." It is strictly present; the rescuing is now going on, the wrath is yet to come. The two do not synchronise. *Cf.* Meyer–Bornemann, 1894, *ad loc.*

from one "order" or "kingdom" to the other, they are removed from the sphere of wrath. Ὀργή falls upon that world to which belong ἁμαρτία, νόμος, θάνατος, φθορά. Those whose citizenship is in another world thereby escape it. They are by the goodness of God "rescued (ἐρύσατο) from the power of darkness and transferred into the kingdom of the son of his love" (Col. i: 13). Wrath shall come upon "the world," but "our citizenship is in heaven." "God did not appoint us unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through Jesus our Master, who died for us, that whether we wake or fall asleep, together with him we should enter into life."[1]

The passage of I. Thess. which deals most definitely with the resurrection is iv: 13–17. Here Paul gives explicit expression to his belief concerning the resurrection of Christians at the parousia and its relations to the rising of Jesus. Here the believers are expressly contrasted with οἱ λοιποί, the rest of men, who have no hope of resurrection for their dead. The Thessalonian Christians have no fear for themselves, for their own change into the spirit-body at the parousia, but for those of their number who die, who are not on earth, but in Hades, when the Lord comes, there is doubt. Shall they not miss the blessedness of his coming, and while they may ultimately enter the glorious kingdom, yet be delayed and forced to pass through experiences of trial and testing?

[1] I. Thess, v: 9 f. The aorist *ζήσωμεν* means: put on life, attain life, not merely: live. There is effective contrast of *ἀποθανόντος* with *ζήσωμεν*. "Wake or sleep" of course takes up the thought of iv: 13 ff.; *καθεύδω* in v: 6 f. is clearly used in another sense.

The answer to all such questioning is the case of Jesus himself, the great Master. He did not pass through the supreme change while alive, as many of us shall be privileged to do. He died, as your friends have died; yet he rose again in triumph. So also we are sure that these shall be brought up from death and appear with him at his parousia. So far, indeed, from being behind us that remain alive, they shall precede us. As the Lord descends, and the trumpet sounds, they shall rise, glorious in their heavenly dress; then we who have not died shall be changed into the same spirit-body, and casting behind us flesh and earth, we shall all rise together, a shining company, into the clouds upon which our Lord rides, to meet and greet him in the air. This is "the parousia of our Lord Jesus with all his saints" (iii: 13).[1] This is very clear, very literal, very artless, and it is the picture that remained in Paul's mind until he, too, fell asleep, and in his dying hour joined in thought that company of the dead in Christ who shall rise first, content, perhaps, at the end, not to be among those who should be alive and left when the Lord should come.

Into verse 17 we must read what the apostle passes over as taken for granted, the "changing" of the living from the physical body to the spirit-body, as in I. Cor. xv: 52. "We that are alive [shall be changed and] together with them shall be caught up."[2] It is

[1] *Cf.* Teichmann, p. 22.

[2] The "change" of the living into another body is "wohl stillschweigend vorausgesetzt," Meyer–Bornemann *ad loc.* So Ellicott *ad loc.* Thackeray, p. 109, also p. 112, because "no transformation of the earthly bodies is spoken of," thinks Paul expected the risen and the surviving Christians to carry their

to be noted that Paul does not here use the verb *rise* (ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρομαι)[1] of any except the *deceased* Christians. Strictly speaking, those who are still alive are *changed*, they do not *rise*. The word *rise*, postulating transition from a lower place to a higher, means issuance from Hades, the underworld, or Sheol. Resurrection is always, in strict usage, ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν. The distinction is not always sharply drawn, for in essence the process is the same whether the living be "changed" or the dead be raised and given a new body, yet Paul does not, and could not, use the phraseology: the living rise. I. Cor. xv. illustrates how inevitably the subject of ἐγείρεσθαι is νεκρός or νεκροί. Verse 22 instinctively substitutes ζωοποιηθήσονται for ἐγερθήσονται because πάντες includes Christians alive at the parousia as well as those who have died.[2]

The distinction, we have said, is not always sharply

---

physical bodies into the Kingdom of God, ever to be with the Lord. This idea Paul, however, gives up before writing I. Cor. Surely it is an absurdity thus to press the *argumentum e silentio*, and to assume a complete change of conception each time an idea is expressed not previously expressed in so many words. We may be permitted to repeat Wernle's saying, "Paul did not possess a modern theologian's capacity for altering his opinions." I. Thess. iv: 17 is most strikingly brought into connection with II. Cor. iv: 1ff. in the passage from the "Ascension of Isaiah," quoted *supra*, p. 100, especially in the phrase (iv: 17): "And afterwards they [those alive at the parousia] will turn themselves upward in their garments, and their body will be left in the world."

[1] ἀνίστασθαι is used by Paul for rising from the dead only in I. Thess. iv: 14 and 16. ἐγείρειν he uses some forty times, the noun ἀνάστασις eight times. Milligan *ad* I. Thess. iv: 14.

[2] xv: 36 refers only to deceased Christians; "that which thou sowest is not quickened (ζωοποιεῖται) except it die"; but, as in vs. 22, some may be made alive without being "sown," or dying.

drawn by Paul, for there is a sense, and a very real sense, in which every Christian, by the simple act of becoming a Christian, dies, rises from the dead, puts on the spiritual life and its body. By faith this experience becomes his here and now, in anticipation, and it is this resurrection through faith, through which every believer has already passed, which is meant in the majority of Paul's allusions to the subject. Typical is Col. iii: 1, "If ye then were raised with Christ, seek the things that are above," or Rom. vi: 4, "like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." This, simply for convenience' sake, without concerning ourselves with the precise applicability of the term, we may call "the ethical resurrection."

Now unless we enter into the real thought of Paul at this point, we shall not understand at all what he meant by his religion. This ethical resurrection is the real, vital experience of which the literal resurrection at the parousia is only the outward objective realisation. Paul's interest is not primarily in eschatology, but in spiritual redemption. What his whole being cries out for, and finds in the gospel of Jesus, is not the reshaping of environment—body, world, conditions of life—but the reshaping and revitalising of his own moral personality. His need is for the attainment of a new principle of life, which should free him at once from every claim and consequence of the old order and make him a citizen of that diviner, spiritual order of life which is God's blessed and blessing will for his children.

Here Paul was the true disciple of his Master. For Jesus, too, preach, as he did, unceasingly of the King-

dom of God, and point, as he did, ever forward to the speedy fulfilment of his people's eschatological expectations, yet in his heart of hearts knew God as Father, not as King, and unconsciously preached, through his preaching, the timeless union of the soul with God as the highest good, man's original destiny. Both these men held fast the two ideals, and never fully realised their discrepance, if they are discrepant; but the religious ideal of both has lived and shaped the world's life, even when their eschatology has been ignored, denied, or made the meaningless formula of a creed.

Paul has one sublime idea, call it "justification by faith," or what we will. It is that through Jesus has been revealed and actualised a new order of life, a new principle of living. It is new to men, but in reality it was God's ideal for his children's life from the beginning. He meant that men should live in the spirit as he, their father, lived; should share his life, his glory, his bliss; should live consciously as his children, not under his orders, but doing his will because they loved him, because his will was their will. Man as Son in the fullest sense, heir of all the riches of the Father, this is man as God created him in his ideal and purpose; man created in the image, bodily and spiritual, of the Father out of whose life issues the life of man.

But man as he has lived upon earth, historically, has not realised this ideal. That is only too evident to Paul, to any thinking mind. There was a sad blunder made, somehow, at the beginning of man's career on earth, a fall into a lower kind and conception of life. Naturally this "fall" is connected with the

name of Adam, the founder of the human family on earth; just how Paul conceived the terrible mistake to have been made, it is not necessary here to stop to inquire. At any rate, man, as history finds him, is not the being of God's ideal. He lives a life commonly degraded and low; spirituality, wisdom, bliss, deathlessness, glory, are qualities he does not possess. Of God he has some knowledge, dimmer or clearer, but his conception of his relation to God is, even in its highest form, of God as Lord and himself as slave. God has given him laws and rules, as expressions of his will; the Jewish race has even a specially revealed code of laws whose observance God enjoins; but all this is an ineffectual makeshift, far from that original ideal. The most scrupulous observer of the most definite code is none the less wretched, and the more clearly he sees what he was meant to be, the less peace does all his law-abiding bring him. And if his lot is a miserable one, he who knows of the higher destiny and the supremer duty of man, what of all the hosts of ignorance and wickedness and idolatry? Surely, as it is written,

"There is none righteous, no, not one;
There is none that understandeth,
There is none that seeketh after God.
They have all turned aside, they are altogether become unprofitable;
There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one."[1]

All have missed the mark (ἥμαρτον) and fall short of the glory of God (Rom. iii: 23). Of them truly is it said, "Destruction and misery are in their ways,

[1] Psalm xiv: 1–3, as quoted in Rom. iii: 10–12.

and the way of peace have they not known" (iii: 16 f.). Such is man as he is· such is not man as he was meant to be.

But meantime God has not given up his ideal; God has not ceased to cherish that diviner Man, made in the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation. That heavenly man Paul conceives as existing through the ages with God, an ever-present ideal, yet never come to realisation in a living man on the earth. This "pre-existence" of the heavenly man we need not here further discuss; it is a fixed part of the substructure on which Paul's faith is builded.[1]

Now, in the fulness of time, God determines—or rather, has determined before the worlds—to make a new beginning, a second creation. At the first creation the "man" who actually came to realisation on earth was not the ideal Son of God, but a weaker, imperfect ἄνθρωπος. He became the founder and head of a race upon whom came ills never meant for man,—sin, death, corruption,—for whom service of God was possible only through conformity to laws and precepts. Meant to be sons, they were at best slaves. Now should the heavenly Man be sent as a second Adam; he should appear on earth born of a woman, a human being like his prototype, to initiate a new order of men, the original divine order of the divine plan.[2] But this order should not descend from him by process of human generation; rather by the process of spiritual kindling and quickening. They who enter the new order do it, not by being born, but

[1] *Cf.* Holsten, pp. 74 f.

[2] On the first and second Adams, *cf.* Holsten, pp. 72–74; Thackeray, pp. 44 f.

by being born again, as John, whose gospel is a setting forth of essentially Pauline ideas, has it; the founder of the new order gives to already living men power to become sons of God by a birth which is "not of blood, nor of the will of flesh, nor of a man's will, but of God."

We have, then, a new creation, which is to make good all that the first creation made ill, and which is conceived in large measure according to the analogy of the first creation. The current apocalyptic could at this point contribute to the shaping of Paul's thought and phraseology.[1] The new Adam is to be a life-giving spirit; he is to be able to communicate to all who come into spiritual fellowship with him the gift of the divine life, even as the first Adam entailed upon his descendants death and sin. The second Adam is born of a woman, in the likeness of sinful flesh, under the law, in all things made like the men of the old order. And so he is able to redeem them into the new order. Any man, now living or yet to live, may pass over from the one order to the other. The transfer may be called adoption (υἱοθεσία, Rom. viii: 15; Gal. iv: 5); it may be called redemption or justification or salvation. It is the becoming what God wanted men to be; it is being rescued from all the ills incident to the old order, and from the wrath which shall fall upon the wrong and wickedness of that order.

How is this transfer to be effected? To answer that question we must first ask: What does it actually

[1] For the apocalyptic view of the parallelism between the creation of the present world and the eschatological events in which the new age is born, *cf.* H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1895, pp. 367–371; Hugo Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der Israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, 1905, p. 199.

effect? What are the elements of which one must get rid, as belonging to the old order, and what are those which must be assumed, as belonging to the new? First of all those things which are to be done away is the human σῶμα in its present embodiment of σάρξ. As flesh, it is subject to every ill, its fleshly substance is the seat of sin, of evil passions and desires, of vile deeds. It is the abode of weakness, of sickness; its certain fate is death and corruption. This physical body must, therefore, be gotten rid of, with all the passions and lusts of it, with its sin and death and corruption. And there must be assumed a new σῶμα, embodied in a new substance, the seat of new desires, under no impulsion to sin, unsubject to death. The body of the new order is the σῶμα πνευματικόν, a body like that of God himself. The transfer from one order to the other likewise means ceasing any obligation to the law which has hitherto expressed God's will and dictated man's action. In the new order law has no place; men are to live as children, not as slaves.

Now how are men to get rid of the earthly body and of allegiance to the law? The older Jewish theology had a ready answer to this question; simply by dying. Death stripped the self of its fleshly garments, and sent it shivering and naked into the underworld, where it no longer had opportunity or obligation to keep the law (Rom. vii: 1). And the righteous might look forward to a resurrection, at the end of the age, into a new and better body, and to a blessed life in the presence of God.

That view is Paul's also; but under his Christian experience it vastly expands and becomes transfigured. It becomes a part of his faith in a greater redemption,

a redemption which is not merely a reward for virtuous conduct, promised to law-abiding Israelites at the end of time, but the immediate opportunity for every man to become what he would have been had the initial fall of humanity in Adam never taken place. Man fallen, sinful, under law, belonging to the old order, is divided into Jew and Gentile. In that old order, so long as it is valid, that distinction is valid and useful. In that order, the Jewish law and all the institutions connected with the observance of the peculiar people have their place. But they have no place in the new order, as they had no place in God's original ideal of humanity. Man as redeemed is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free; not even male or female, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven.

To every man alive, irrespective of race or creed or status, comes now the opportunity of going over into the new order. And that order is the Kingdom of God, in Paul's language. As men go over into it, one by one, hundred by hundred, there builds up, under Paul's eyes, the company of the redeemed, the community of "saints," who are in the original sense children of God, the Messianic fellowship which is to form the society of the new age. When the wrath of God falls on this present age, the present order of life with its sin and corruption, the members of the new order shall be untouched of it, for they dwell apart, in another sphere.

But still we have not answered the question: How is the transfer to be made, and made now, by living men who are a part of the present world? The answer is perhaps not easy to set forth in words; it is none the

less very clear and definite, as Paul conceives it. The heavenly Man—let us call him Messiah—comes to earth and is born like his brethren, a Jew under the law, subject to the contingencies of mortal existence. This was not at all a necessary part of the common expectation about Messiah; at least, such a preliminary appearance of Messiah as an ordinary human being had no significance in any Messianic conception. Messiah was an eschatological figure, and his work was to be miraculous and spectacular, as that of the glorious King inaugurating the new age amid the ruins of the old. But Paul, while in no degree giving up the eschatological function of Messiah, unites with it another, that of his pure life and martyr-death as a man on earth, before the real Messianic work begins. Here again we see that Paul's *primary* interest was not eschatological; the eschatological programme is really only the realisation and completion of the essential and proper process of redemption already accomplished in the earthly career of Messiah. Neither Jesus nor Paul displaced the Jewish Messianic conception by another; they added to it another. Messiah lives on earth a pure life, obedient to the law; he is the teacher and the friend of men; he exemplifies the kind of life God meant his sons to live, the relation to God which is at once all men's privilege and duty. Himself essentially of another order, sin has no hold on him; the law he keeps naturally, but his righteousness is not limited to its observance, exceeding that of the strictest scribes and Pharisees, the expression of his own pure nature. He lives as the typical Son of God, exemplifying the new order. The old order instinctively hates him, opposes him, and brings him ulti-

mately to death. But death has no real hold on him, as it has none on the sons of God, according to God's plan. It simply means for him the laying aside of the earthly body which he has assumed. The only thing which gives death real hold on men is the sin and corruption incident to the "fall" and the body of flesh.

Thus the new order is founded. Its head, the new Adam, has lived as a man on earth, has escaped from all the penalties of the old order, escaped from death, entered into the life which God meant his sons to live. It only remains for other men to follow him, to press with eagerness into the Kingdom. As the first Adam begat children and surrounded himself with a numerous progeny, so the second Adam surrounds himself with an ever-increasing company of those who by a birth of the spirit enter the new order. This new birth is the act of faith. As Adam's fall and sin are valid not only for himself, but are entailed upon all his descendants, those who are bound to him by the relation of physical generation, so the second Adam lives and dies and conquers not for himself alone. His experience is representative and is entailed on all those who come into spiritual relationship with him. He has lived a life independent of Adam's fall, just as if he were the first man; he has escaped any domination of sin, any bondage to death; he has entered into the heavenly body and the heavenly life. All these things become immediately true of every one who establishes the spiritual relationship to him, who, in Paul's phrase, puts faith in him, in short, who becomes a Christian.

If to escape the physical body with all the lusts of its flesh, if to become free from obligation to the law,

we must die, then we have died, in Messiah's death. We are, therefore, already free from these things. Law, sin, death, corruption—these and their like have no longer any dominion over us, because we have removed to a sphere where they have no jurisdiction or application, never did have, never were meant to have. For us Adam's fall and all its consequences are nullified; we start anew, and this time we start aright. This is the meaning of becoming a Christian. In the old days we read God's law and tried to observe it; now we have God's spirit. The very spirit of the divine Father himself comes into us and makes us divine beings, forms the substance and the reality of our lives. As all our old life was tainted and spoiled by the flesh in which lay the seat of countless evils, now our lives are made pure and holy by the divine spirit in which we live. Jewish eschatology promised that after we had died, had remained in the underworld as naked souls until the end of time, had then been presented before God's throne for judgment and pronounced worthy, we should receive the new body and enter the heavenly life. Paul affirms that by the simple act of becoming a Christian, all that is accomplished. It all lies behind us—death, judgment, resurrection, and the entrance upon the heavenly life.

Now it is evident that there is just one point in which this simple and sublime construction of Paul's seems to be contradicted by reality. In becoming Christians men did not lose their physical bodies; they continued as before to live in the flesh, with all its passions, and therefore still fell into sin and vice. Any one of Paul's letters is abundant evidence of that.

But Paul does not allow this obvious fact to negate his conviction. What he has said of the Christian's transfer to the new order is ideally true; it is literally true of the inward man. He still keeps his body of flesh, indeed, but that is, however practically important, in reality a secondary matter. It is but for a very brief time; any day, any hour, may see the change into the other body. The change is not wrought individually upon Christians, as they one by one come into the new order; the Jewish ideas of resurrection and the coming of Messiah here control Paul's thought. It is wrought for all together, at one time, at the great day of the Lord. Those Christians who have in death laid aside the physical body have not gone at once into the new body and the heavenly life, but have lain asleep for the brief interval. Those who remain alive shall experience the change as the dead rise incorruptible, and all alike shall join their Lord and Head to live with him for ever as the Sons of God. That actual external material realisation must, then, wait a little, a few days, or weeks, or years; but the real resurrection, the real passage into the new order of life, of which that is but the formal completion, has already taken place. It belongs to the past. The kind of life, in principle, which is to be lived in the Kingdom of God, the kind of life which is characteristic of the new order, which is the essence of the new order, that kind of life the Christian has already begun to live. Since that is true, the rest may come in its good time; the essential thing is an accomplished fact.

Thus hastily and incompletely we have sketched Paul's conception of what is meant by becoming a Christian. It need not be pointed out how essentially

unrelated it is to anything which passes for "orthodoxy" in modern "evangelical" churches. Our sole purpose in presenting it here is to get the proper point of view for understanding what Paul says about the Christians' resurrection. His letters, particularly those to the Galatians and the Romans, are little more than explications, from one or another point of view, of this conception of Christianity. It is the one theme that can concern him when he writes to his churches.

Read Galatians, for example, with this construction in mind. The very greeting is significant. "Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Messiah and God the Father who raised him from among the dead) to the churches of Galatia." A similar insistence that Paul's call to apostleship came through the will of God is found in the salutation of I. Cor., II. Cor., and Col., and, in somewhat less direct form, in Romans ("separated unto the Gospel of God . . . Jesus Messiah our Master, through whom we received grace and apostleship"). This insistence is directed against the Judaistic slander that Paul, in distinction from the Twelve, had no call from Jesus to the apostleship. His call, he avows, came from God himself, and thus really ranks above the call of the Twelve, if comparisons are to be made. This repeated reference to Paul's call from God has in mind the Damascus experience, his vision of the risen Lord, as is explicitly said in Gal. i: 1, where the call comes through Jesus *and* God who raised him from the dead, thereby rendering possible his appearance and call to Paul. So in i: 15 f., "it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me from my mother's

womb [separated unto the gospel of God, Rom. i: 1], and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me," and that the reference is to his conversion near Damascus Paul shows by the following words, "immediately I . . . went away into Arabia, and again I returned unto Damascus." As the substance of Paul's gospel was not received save through revelation of Jesus Messiah (i: 12), so was his call to proclaim that gospel given in the same revelation of Jesus (δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ 1: 12 = ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί i: 15). The same is the clear statement of I. Cor. ix: 1: οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑώρακα; the call *from* God comes *through* Jesus, risen and appearing in his glorious body.[1]

Gal. ii: 19–21 is a clear expression of what we have called "the ethical resurrection." In the person of Messiah "through law to law I died, that to God I might become alive. With Messiah have I also been crucified, and live no more do I, but there lives within me Messiah. And what I now live in flesh, in faith I live of the Son of God who set his love upon me and gave himself up in my behalf. I reject not the grace of God, for if through law righteousness [is attainable] then Messiah in vain laid down his life." This rough literal rendering of the Greek hardly needs comment. Paul believes that Jesus rose that he might return in power to set up the Kingdom and call all believers to resurrection; but he believes further—and here lies his chief concern—that Jesus rose that in him all

[1] This insistence on Paul's divine call does not appear in the salutation of I. Thess., Phil., or Philemon, as the slander did not need combating to the recipients of these letters.

believers might rise to the freedom of the life of sonship. The believer shares the death of Messiah, and is so freed from law, sin, and further death; his continued life is really the life of the heavenly man, the Son of God, in him. He has shared Messiah's resurrection, he shares his pure and heavenly life. As far as his continued life in the flesh is concerned, that he lives in faith, in the conscious appropriation of Messiah's life, and therefore in a perfect δικαιοσύνη which God accepts. If this δικαιοσύνη (what God really means by righteousness) were possible of attainment by keeping the Jewish code, then all in vain were the death of Messiah by which it is now made possible. It is Jesus' death as effecting the Christian's death to sin and resurrection to righteousness that is here in mind. That is the point of view from which Paul depicted him crucified before the very eyes of the Galatians (iii: 1); the connection here is very close.

Precisely the same is the motive of the apostle in preaching in Corinth "Jesus Messiah and him crucified," a preaching that contained the only salvation for the world, however it might seem but foolishness to the scornful sophist. And so in Gal. vi: 14 f., Paul glories in one thing alone, in the cross of Messiah, for on that cross the old world-order, the flesh with its passions and lusts (v: 24), sin and death and despair, have all been crucified. The old Paul has there died; the Paul who now lives is a new creation (καινὴ κτίσις). The observance of law is powerless in any way to make that new creature, powerless to do away with the body of sin and death and remake the man. What the law could not do, deliver the despairing soul from this body of death, God, sending his own Son, has done

(Rom. viii: 3). The old man, with his doings, is put off; the new man is put on, the man who walks by the spirit, not by the flesh, for the flesh has been crucified. The new spiritual organism is even now ours, in a very real sense, and in it we are to live (Gal. v: 16–25); for real δικαιοσύνη or justification is not possible in the flesh-body, but only in the spirit-body. So beautifully does the apostle write (II. Cor. v: 14–17), "One died in behalf of all, therefore all died. And in behalf of all he died that they who live no longer to themselves should live, but to him who in their behalf died—and rose. So that we from now on know no one according to the flesh; even if we have known according to the flesh Messiah, yet now no longer do we know him so. So that if any one is in Messiah, there is a new creation. The things of the earlier order (τὰ ἀρχαῖα) passed away; new things have come." Thus has God "translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col. i: 13).

The epistle to the Romans is in substance an explication of this same great idea of the Christian as redeemed, as dying and rising, by the act of appropriating as his own the experiences of Messiah. In one sense it may be said that its constant theme is the resurrection. Rom. i: 4 we have already touched upon. The Greek here (ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ...ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν) is perhaps a little awkward, but ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν is here one word, as it were, like the German *Todtenauferstehung.*[1] The divine power which shall raise all believers into new life realised this great experience first and most strikingly in him, raising him from his temporary submission to the vicis-

[1] So Meyer–Weiss, Sanday–Headlam, *et al.*

situdes of mortality into the complete glory of actualised sonship. From the death of the cross, "God highly exalted him and gave him a name which is above every name" (Phil. ii: 9). "He was crucified through weakness, but he liveth through the power of God" (II. Cor. xiii: 4), that God of whose power the highest is said when one says, "He makes alive the dead, and calls the things that are not as though they were" (Rom. iv: 17).

But the great purpose of this supreme act of the divine power was that men might through the dying and rising of Messiah pass into the same state of sonship of which he is the embodiment and exemplification. "Delivered for our trespasses, he was raised for our justification" (Rom. iv: 24 f.). By faith passing over into the life of sonship, we are what God wants us to be, δίκαιος in his sight, and are at peace with him. This is the argument of Romans v. The death of Jesus led to our reconciliation with God; his present life, shared by us, is our saving (v: 10). As death came upon men in their relationship to Adam, so life becomes their portion as related to Messiah. Chapter vi. has the whole argument in its first eleven verses. "We who were baptised (literally: dipped) into Messiah were baptised into his death. We were buried therefore with him through the baptism, into the death, in order that, as Messiah was raised from among the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we in newness of life might walk (περιπατήσωμεν, aorist, = might set out on our walk, in freshness of life; walk = life-career.) For if we have become united (σύμφυτοι = grown together) to him by the likeness of his death, on the other hand (ἀλλά) we shall also

be by the likeness of his resurrection, knowing this, that our old (πάλαιος, of long ago, the opposite of νέος, fresh, recent) man was crucified with him, in order that the body of sin (the physical body of flesh, in which sin has its seat) might be done away with, so that we be no longer enslaved to sin, for the dead man has been justified from sin. If we died with Messiah we believe that we shall also become alive (συνζήσομεν) with him; knowing that Messiah, being raised from among the dead, dies no more, death no further has mastery (κυριεύει) over him. For in that he died (ὃ ἀπέθανεν = in dying), he died to sin once for all; but in that he lives (ὃ ζῇ = as concerns his life), he lives to God. So also you, account yourselves to be dead to sin, but living to God in Messiah Jesus." Comment on this luminous passage is unnecessary. It may only be pointed out that the doing away with the body of sin (vi: 6), even ideally by faith, and even more certainly in actual realisation at the parousia, is utterly incompatible with the idea of the physical body as the subject of resurrection and as being made over into the "spiritual body" of the new life.

Ideally the mortal body has been laid aside, with all its lusts and passions, its weakness, corruption, and mortality. Actually we still keep it for a longer or shorter period, brief at the longest, but we must live as if freed from it, undominated by any element in it. God and his grace are already the sweet compulsion of our living; to him we present ourselves, as already alive from the dead. Discharged from our service to sin, our wages of death received, we now receive the gracious gift of eternal life from Messiah Jesus our new Master. vii: 1–6 continues the same thought of trans-

ference from one service and order of life to another; it is so real for Paul that he can write (vii: 5), "when *we were* in the flesh." One with Messiah, his people share the experiences of his σῶμα. In the putting off of its garment of flesh, in the assumption of its garment of spirit, they share (vii: 4). They have been "reconciled in the body of his flesh through death" is the very direct statement of Col. i: 22, which is the precise meaning of Rom. v: 10, "reconciled to God through the death of his Son." Perfect harmony with God, such as he intended for his children, is possible only for those who live no longer in the flesh, but in the spirit. Such is the living of every Christian; living in the Spirit, and the Spirit living in him. Otherwise he is no Christian (viii: 9). The possession of the Spirit excludes that of the physical body; we live in the flesh *or* in the spirit, in the σῶμα σαρκικόν *or* the σῶμα πνευματικόν. The either–or is exclusive. Our temporary status, living in the spirit and in the physical body at once, is merely temporary and forms no real contradiction of the principle. The body may seem to be here, alive; it is in reality dead and removed from any influence on our living. Our life is spirit-life, just as truly as if our body were already the spirit-body. "If the spirit of him that raised Jesus from among the dead dwells in you, he that raised from the dead Messiah Jesus shall make alive also your mortal bodies through his spirit dwelling in you" (viii: 11). This at first sight might appear to imply a restoration to life of the buried physical body, and it has been so interpreted. But, as Charles[1] points out, τὰ θνήτα σώματα ὑμῶν does not mean: your dead and buried

[1] Charles, p. 402, note.

bodies, as if τὰ νεκρὰ σώματα were written, but only: your bodies that are *subject to death*. Paul is thinking of his readers, with himself, as alive at the parousia. Then the divine spirit, dwelling already within the σῶμα of every Christian, shall cast off the clothing of flesh, which makes the σῶμα at present θνητόν, and the body shall stand forth a thing of spirit, deathless and glorious. It is but a somewhat fuller way of saying: We shall be changed.

Here it must be remarked that in his utterances concerning resurrection, Paul is not commonly thinking of the future experience of dead Christians at all. As a matter of fact, Paul does not expect there will be any great number of dead Christians. Those who "rise from the dead," in the literal sense, will be comparatively few. The great bulk of those who enter the Kingdom and the spirit-body shall do so by the experience of "change," while yet alive. In I. Thess. iv: 13 ff. and in I. Cor. xv the question had been raised: What of the Christians who die? And Paul had answered it. But commonly he is thinking of a resurrection or transition attained without dying. Rom. xiv: 8 f. reckons with the possibility of the death of some of the readers, II. Cor. i: 9 and chapters iv and v, with the possibility of Paul's own death, but these passages are exceptions. The word νεκρός Paul uses more frequently in I. Cor. xv and in the first ten chapters of Romans than anywhere else, and here it stands more often for those out from whose company Jesus rose than for those who shall themselves rise.

Without therefore limiting in any degree the importance of resurrection in Paul's thought, it is clear that his chief concern is not with the literal resur-

rection from the dead, which Jesus experienced, which Christians who die prior to the parousia shall experience. It is rather with what we have called the ethical resurrection, as an experience of living men. Paul does not himself expect to rise ἐκ νεκρῶν; he does not expect most of his readers to, for the simple reason that he does not expect himself and them to go πρὸς νεκρούς. W. Haller has very properly called attention to the fact that for Paul resurrection was the reviving of those not long dead, in any case, whose bodies would in most instances not have been subjected to total dissolution.[1] But Kennedy with still more pertinence goes farther and points out that Paul's "thoughts dwelt more on the future condition of those living when Christ should appear, than on that of the dead."[2] It is obvious that if this fact be carefully weighed in its bearing on Paul's teaching concerning resurrection, it will necessitate a rather complete reshaping of much that has been written on the subject. Outside of I. Thess. iv and I. Cor. xv there are but three possible allusions to the rising of νεκρόι (of course Christian νεκρόι) in the literal sense. These are Rom. iv: 17, II. Cor. i: 9, which are most general expressions of the power of God to "raise the dead," and

[1] Haller, p. 291. On p. 286 Haller points out that Jesus, like Paul, says little of the resurrection of believers, because he expects the end of this age while most of his followers are still alive (*cf.* Mark ix: 1). Those who do not "taste of death" cannot "rise from the dead." So Paul hopes for himself and most of his readers (Haller, p. 289). Such a saying as that of I. Thess. iv: 15–18, based on "a word of the Lord," is in truth equivalent to what Jesus has in mind in sayings like Mark ix: 1. *Cf.* Schwartzkopff, p. 81, and some good remarks by Schweitzer, p. 363.

[2] Kennedy, p. 261.

Rom. xiv: 9, which is scarcely more definite. Elsewhere νεκρόι who rise are men dead in sin who rise into the new order of life, as in the words to the Colossians (ii: 13), "you being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you did he make alive together with him." I. Cor. vi: 14 (ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ) and II. Cor. iv: 14 (ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ) seem to be the only other clear statements of the literal resurrection of dead Christians.

The Christian, then, though still living in the flesh (Rom. viii: 12), has no further obligation to it; his entire obligation is to the spirit, the substance of his new life. The deeds of his fleshly body he puts to death and so lives entirely, though as yet ideally, in the spirit-body (viii: 13). He is now a son and heir of God, in the fullest sense, heir to all the glory which his great Master has already begun to enjoy. His present sufferings, however great they may be, are not worthy to be named in comparison with that inheritance of glory, into which he also is about to enter. It is nothing less than the ideal life of God's original plan, a life of blessedness which eye has not seen, or ear heard, which has not entered into the heart of man. For it the whole creation has been waiting and groaning in travail since the beginning of time. The creation, as God meant it, was a community of free children of God, in spiritual bodies, in a spiritual world of blessedness, a world without sin or pain or death or corruption. That creation was not realised in the world of Adam and his posterity; its realisation has now begun in the work of the new Adam. Its perfect realisation is about to dawn, in a new heaven and a new earth, a perfect environment for perfect men. We share

already in the life of that perfect world-order, having the first fruits of the spirit (viii: 23) as a pledge of its full possession (ἀρραβῶν τοῦ πνεύματος, II. Cor. v: 5). But meantime, bound to the flesh, we sigh with impatience for the complete actualisation of our adoption, the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) of our σῶμα from flesh to spirit. That redemption will conform us outwardly in substance as inwardly in spirit to the image of God's Son, who shares no glory of nature that shall not be ours, but has only entered upon his inheritance sooner than we, as the first-born among many brothers (viii: 29). The complete realisation of our expectation is guaranteed by the inviolable purpose of the God who began in us the process of adoption (viii: 30). What wonder, then, at the sublime shout of confident exultation, which finds great words and yet is too great for all words (viii: 31–39)?

No system of Christian theology that was ever devised has adequately reproduced the sublimely simple religious fact which Paul puts into the words: Christ died for us. For Paul was not a theologian, but a passionate mystic, struggling to put into words for the redemption of other lives something too great for words, which had been the redemption of his own life. For me to live is Christ. Can the longest paraphrase of the commentator make those four words ἐμοὶ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός any clearer? The absolute mastery of the Christian's life by Messiah's life is something no words can fully express. No vicissitude of life, not death itself, can weaken in any degree that relationship. "For to this end Messiah died and became alive, that both of dead and of living he might become Master" (Rom. xiv: 9). In his death he shared

every experience that death brings to any man. He went into the underworld of Hades,[1] though but for the briefest tarrying, and even there the tie that binds his follower to him is unweakened. The "faith" by which one enters into this *unio mystica*, and confesses to the mastery of Messiah's life, is in itself salvation; and it is a faith which may become the portion of every human being alike, Jew or Greek, bond, free, Scythian, barbarian, man, woman, child (Rom. x:9–13; Col. iii:11).

At some length we have recalled the utterances of Paul to the Romans, for the whole letter is a setting forth of the great theme which is engaging us. So also is Col. i:1 to iii:17 an explication of the same idea; in the death and resurrection of Messiah the Christian shares, and the Christian life is the life of the Kingdom, of the new world-order, precisely the life we shall live in the spirit-body, precisely the life Jesus is now living above. The first two chapters of Colossians have not reached us precisely as they left the pen of Paul, but the interpolators have not obscured the marvellous expression of the apostle's faith in resurrection, in the deepest, fullest sense of that word. Nearly every verse has something of that expression. Many of the passages have already been noted. The crown of it all is iii:1–4. One cannot read that and still think Paul's interest in resurrection to lie chiefly in the restoration to life of such Christians as shall die. It is an exhortation to living men. "If therefore ye were raised together with Messiah, seek the things above,

[1] Paul nowhere uses the word ᾅδης, but the idea is plain in the free paraphrase of Deut. xxx: 11 f. in Rom. x:7. The correct reading of I. Cor. xv:55 has θάνατε in both clauses.

where Messiah is seated at the right hand of God. Be mindful of the things above, not of the things upon earth. For ye died, and your life has been hid with Messiah in God. When Messiah shall be manifested, your life, then you too along with him shall be manifested in glory." As Messiah's present life is unseen, there in the presence of God, so our true lives are unseen, hid there with his. The life in the flesh which we still live is simply not our true life. Its values are no longer valid. The only life which can tempt desire is the hidden life, the risen life. "I count all things to be loss for the superiority of the knowledge of Messiah, of Jesus my Master, that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and fellowship of his sufferings, being conformed to his death, if somehow I may attain to the resurrection from the dead" (Phil. iii: 8–11). Here, too, it is not the resurrection that is mediated by physical death which the apostle desires above all things to make his own, but the resurrection which is an experience of his life. Physical death, and therefore the certain promise of literal resurrection, may be before him, but the real goal toward which he presses is something far more central and immediate, the prize of the upward calling of God in Christ Jesus, the glorious freedom of the Sons of God. Resurrection as spiritually experienced in Christ, and resurrection perhaps to be experienced as one who is among the νεκρόι at the parousia, are here not distinctly separated in the apostle's mind. In the uncertainty as to his fate, this whole epistle is given a double aspect; now continued life, now speedy death, seems the probable issue. He is himself not anxious, nor has much choice between the alternatives; to live is Christ,

to die is gain. Whether he lives or dies, the sharing of the risen life of his Master is the one blessing he craves. This is resurrection from the dead, this is life eternal.

If, with these utterances of Paul in mind, we turn to the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke, and read the account of what the evangelist means by the resurrection of Jesus, it will at once be clear that what he means is divided by the breadth of heaven from what the apostle means.[1] If we might for a season completely forget the gospel narrative and read Paul for himself, we might not always understand his full meaning, but we certainly could by no possibility get the impression that by Jesus' resurrection he means any renewed activity on the part of the buried body. He rose from the dead: on that Paul stakes his life. But to fancy Paul asserting that the gravestone must be rolled away to make this possible, that *anything* came out of the grave, that a body walked and talked and ate and drank on earth, leaving the tomb empty of its clay; to fancy that angel and earthquake and frightened women are a possible part of Paul's picture of ἡ ἀνάστασις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν—this is to misunderstand him as completely and as culpably as did some among his converts in Corinth, and for the sake of an ecclesiastical tradition to distort and degrade the most original and sublime conception of the way to spiritual freedom that man has yet attained.

[1] *Cf.* Canon Henson, in *Hibbert Journal*, vol. ii., p. 488. He cites Luke xxiv: 36–43, and asks, "Is it possible that the author of I. Cor. xv believed all this?" His reply is "that he certainly did not."

BOOK TWO

THE WITNESS OF MARK

CHAPTER V

THE ATTESTATION

THE gospel narratives are written down long after Paul's work is done and his voice is still, at a time when his letters have become the common property of many churches, but his direct influence has largely been replaced by other types of teaching and practice. The Church has been spreading and growing both inwardly and outwardly since Paul wrote. No man of anything like his power has succeeded him. We have three versions of the gospel, called synoptic, whose sources lie in that Jewish-Christian church which even in Paul's lifetime had entered upon another way than his. Its geographical and ethnographical demarcation from the sphere of his peculiar labours was typical of a deeper difference in mental horizon and spiritual apprehension. This notwithstanding the certain fact, already noted, that in their understanding of the resurrection and its significance, Peter, James, and John, with the rest of the Twelve, were at one with Paul.

Of these gospels one alone, that of Mark, comes from

the pen of a man who had known Paul and, however briefly, had been his companion. Acts xiii pictures Mark as starting out with Paul on his "first missionary journey," but as turning back ere the real work was begun, a vacillation which made Paul refuse to consider him as a companion for the second journey (Acts xv: 37–39). This refusal brings on an estrangement between Paul and his fellow-worker Barnabas, Mark's uncle. Paul's letter to the Galatians lets us see another side of this estrangement: how that Barnabas, and surely Mark as well, had fallen into Peter's "hypocrisy," and had taken the narrower Judaistic view of the Christian gospel. Henceforth they go another way than Paul's. Papias tells us[1] that Mark became a sharer of Peter's missionary work, in the capacity of interpreter. At the close of Paul's life, during his two years of detention in Rome, Mark is again with him as a "fellow-worker," but not as a prisoner (Col. iv: 10; Phm. 24; II. Tim. iv: 11?). How long he has been with Paul there we do not know, or what led to a reconciliation, but their renewed association can at most have been only a matter of months. It has been ten or twelve years since Mark deserted Paul at Perga, and he has no doubt been associated with the Jewish–Christian circles during most of this intervening time. Somewhere from six to ten years after Paul's death in Rome, Mark writes there his gospel, relying for much of its material, as John the presbyter very naturally concludes, on his memories of Peter's missionary

[1] In the often-cited passage, Euseb., *H. E.*, iii., 39. On Mark's personal history *cf.* H. B. Swete, *Gospel According to St. Mark*, 1905, Introduction.

discourses. We must now examine his witness concerning the resurrection of Jesus.

Mark gives us, in distinction from anything in Paul's letters, a narrative of events. He has described the crucifixion and, briefly, the burial of the crucified body in a "tomb hewn out of a rock," before which a stone had been rolled. The two Marys "were observing where he has been put." The twenty-four hours of the Sabbath pass, the grave lying quiet and unvisited. After sunset on the Saturday, Mary Magdalene and Mary of James and Salome go out and purchase spices with which, at the next dawn, they may anoint and, in a measure, embalm, the body of the Master.

Where are the disciples all this time? The last mention of them in Mark's story is the terse statement in the account of Jesus' arrest (xiv: 50): they all left him and fled. Only Peter has appeared since, and he but to curse and swear that he knows not the man who is about to die for him. None of the Twelve appear at the crucifixion, nor is there any indication that any one of them knew how or where Jesus was buried, or whether he was buried at all. Indeed it is not definitely stated that they even knew of Jesus' death, though Peter, at least, must have known that his Master would die before Friday's sun had set, and the other ten, even if they had fled the city, could have little doubt as to the result. But it is worth noting that whatever their fears or expectations, there is no indication in Mark that any one of the disciples had personal knowledge of what had happened to Jesus after the cock-crow which sent Peter, shamed and weeping, out into the dawn.

Only three faithful women see that the body finds burial and take steps for anointing it as best they may for its long rest. Very early on Sunday morning, as the sun has just risen, these three are seen coming to the tomb.[1] And they are saying to each other, "Who will roll back for us the stone from the door of the tomb?" And looking up, they observe that the stone has been rolled back—for it was exceedingly large. And entering into the tomb they saw a youth sitting at the right, clothed in a white robe, and they were struck with amazement. And he said to them, "Be not amazed. You are seeking Jesus, the crucified Nazarene. He was raised; he is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go say to his disciples and to Peter, 'He precedes you into Galilee; there shall you see him, as he told you.'" And coming out they fled from the tomb, for trembling and bewilderment were upon them. And to no one did they say anything, for they were afraid. . . . And here the narrative, and the gospel, come to an abrupt and untimely end in the middle of a sentence. A conclusion of the sentence, and of the narrative, one cannot help conjecturing, but before we ask concerning what is lacking, we may note certain points in what is present.

We are here introduced to three women who are going to open the closed tomb of a man, a member of

[1] Paul le Breton, pp. 21 f., 44, asserts, in defiance of the context, that the women are represented as coming to the grave at the first (hour) of Sabbath, *i.e.*, on Saturday at dawn. He further asserts that "le dimanche était, à l'époque du Christ et plusieurs années après lui, le second jour de la semaine. Le samedi ou sabbat étant alors le premier jour de la semaine."

the family of no one of them, who has been buried about thirty-six hours, in order to anoint the body for burial. They saw the body wrapped in linen and laid away, saw the λίθος μέγας σφόδρα rolled before the entrance, yet they come now on their errand, raising the question as to how the stone may be removed only as they approach the tomb. They apparently trust to the friendly assistance of some chance passer-by to accomplish that to which their united strength is unequal, and to the same fortuitous help to replace the stone when their pious task is done. What these three women together could not do, perhaps one man alone could not, though his assistance might enable them to accomplish it. The stone is indeed μέγας σφόδρα, for it is sufficient to cover a door into the tomb large enough for the women to pass freely in and out. The tomb itself is spacious, for on the right side (of the doorway, as the women enter) is room for a young man to sit, and in the remaining space the three women can stand.

The young man, in his white robe, is clearly a supernatural visitant; he knows the women's errand before they speak, knows of the resurrection, and is charged with a message for the disciples. This message necessarily implies that Jesus, or this heavenly visitant, knew in advance that the women or other followers of Jesus (possibly some of the disciples themselves) would come to the grave to receive it. The νεανίσκος has remained in the tomb for the express purpose of delivering the message to the expected visitants. The message declares that Jesus (that is, the body, which is no longer in the tomb) has departed (προάγει present, he is now preceding) for Galilee; the dis-

ciples, after their expected arrival there, shall see him. No more definite time or place of this "seeing" is indicated, but its promise is said to be but the repetition of a promise already given by Jesus. Such a saying of Jesus we actually find in the text of Mark xiv: 28, "However, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee." The message, despite its importance and its supernatural bearer, is not delivered by the women. With the very strong double negative, οὐδενὶ οὐδέν, "to nobody nothing," Mark declares the non-fulfilment of the angel's bidding.[1] The reason for this strange ignoring of a supernatural command he gives as the women's fear of some one or something not named in our extant text.

So much Mark says when read by himself, without the addition of any details from the other evangelists. He has a narrative of an episode occurring after the death of Jesus, in which no one of the Twelve was an actor, of which the disciples could have known only from the report of others. If we examine Mark's narrative as a whole, we find only five passages, up to the point of Jesus' death, in which he is not present, as the central figure of the scene. Two of these deal with John Baptist. i: 1–8 briefly describes John's mission; vi: 14–29, as briefly, his arrest and death, with their consequences. These narratives had doubtless come to Mark, directly or indirectly, from the

[1] The emphatic nature of this double negative is commonly overlooked. B. Weiss (Meyer–Weiss *ad loc.*) notes it, but misapprehends its purport. John vii: 4 (*οὐδεὶς τι ποιεῖ*), x: 28 (*οὐχ ἁρπάσει τις*), I. Thess. i: 8 (*μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι*) show the milder negative.

followers of John.[1] In any case, John's career was a matter of common knowledge, as Josephus indicates. The three other passages in question have to do with the disciples, either singly or as a whole. vi: 12 f. (30) chronicles, in most cursory fashion, the evangelistic expedition of the Twelve in Galilee; its experiences are later related to Jesus. Peter is no doubt Mark's informant here, as he is for the vivid piece of personal revelation in xiv: 54, 66–72, Peter's denial. There remains xiv: 1 f., 10 f., the plot of the Sanhedrin and the treachery of Judas. There is nothing in this summary notice that the subsequent events did not make clear. Details are strikingly absent, notably any hint of Judas's motive, which apparently no one of his fellow-disciples ever fathomed. So much as is here stated Peter could easily relate to Mark.

The narrative of the crucifixion no doubt came also to Mark from Peter, but there is no indication that Peter was himself an eyewitness of the closing scene. The ones who saw, and related, what took place on Golgotha were certain women looking on from afar, the Marys and Salome and others with them (xv: 40 f.). The visit of Joseph to Pilate may have been related later by the worthy councillor himself; its results the same faithful women saw (xv: 47). It is then these women who are the witnesses to the scene of Sunday morning. Whatever Mark knows of it has ultimately come from them. The "to no one did they say anything" can naturally not be taken absolutely, despite its emphatic form. The only question can be: When

[1] *Cf.* Mat. xiv: 12, "And his disciples . . . went and told Jesus."

was the women's silence broken? The answer to that question is the reconciling of the contradiction between the οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν ἔιπαν and the fact that Mark knows about it.

This definite declaration that the women told no one a single word of all this, Mark sets down simply because he knows no word of it was in the original proclamation of the resurrection, as Peter and James and John and Paul had preached it.[1] Paul's view has already become clear to us, with no place for a possible belief in such a narrative. That view, with its acceptance of the experiences of Cephas and the Twelve, Paul had in turn received from these very men. "Whether then it be I or they, so we preached and so ye believed." But here is a narrative which puts the resurrection in a new light. It has come to Mark, we know not how, in these later days, after the preaching of his masters, Peter and Paul, is over. He is a man far inferior to either of these masters in original thought and in spiritual perception. He had never been wholly congenial to Paul, even though he was in attendance only as a ὑπηρέτης, not as an apostle of the faith; at the best, "he is useful to me for ministering" (II. Tim. iv: 11, if the verse be Paul's). His gospel-narrative reveals a man whose religious conceptions lie nearer the earth than the great Tarsan's, and, while testifying to the accuracy and fidelity of

[1] So J. Weiss, in *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 209, and B. W. Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, p. 232. Arnold Meyer, p. 28, has only part of the truth when he says the women's silence is emphasised "in order to explain why the disciples did not convince themselves of the empty grave by seeing it for themselves."

which John the presbyter speaks, bespeaks also a man who is infinitely inferior to Paul in power to comprehend Jesus, to *sense* the purport of his gospel, if the expression may be allowed. The objectiveness of his narrative constitutes its great value; we cannot be thankful enough that the earliest evangelist was not a thinker like the latest. Mark's narratives of the Gadarene swine and of the withered fig-tree reveal sufficiently the *niveau* of his thought. The story of the empty grave, coming to him after the lapse of perhaps nearly two-score years, he accepts, as not uncongenial to his own thought and the thought of many in his time and environment. Though he is perfectly conscious that Paul and Peter never spoke of the incident, he is not clearsighted enough—as hundreds of exegetes to this day are not—to see how fundamentally irreconcilable with their conception is the presupposition involved in it. It is a simple matter for him to explain their ignorance of the incident—the women did not tell; only of late has the story come out.[1]

In Mark's time, in brief, the error of the Corinthian skeptics, that resurrection has somehow to do with the buried body, is affecting widely the view of Jesus' resurrection. Mark, here as always the honest objective recorder of the gospel tradition, sets down the story as it comes to him. Brandt ascribes too much original creative activity to Mark when he makes

[1] So Schmiedel in *Biblica*, vol. ii., cols. 1879 f.; Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*, p. 146; J. Weiss, *Das Aelteste Evangelium*, 1903, p. 341. "Der Evangelist sich bewusst war, eine nicht allgemein bekannte Tatsache mitzuteilen."

him invent this incident.[1] But it is very clear, as Professor Loofs has argued,[2] that Mark is here reproducing no primitive source, whether from Peter or another, but is only registering a more recent element of tradition.

We may now turn to Mark's uncompleted sentence. It ought to be unnecessary to point out that the sentence *is* uncompleted. Greek sentences are almost as unlikely as English sentences to end with the word *for* (γάρ).[3] But if it is clear that the sentence is incomplete, it is no less clear that the gospel also is incomplete. The author's original plan carried the narrative farther, and included the fulfilment of the promise: there shall ye see him. That Mark should have meant to end thus in the air, with the discovery of an angel in the open tomb, voicing a command which was not obeyed and a promise whose fulfilment is not recorded, is intrinsically incredible, and is rendered quite impossible by the construction of the narrative up to this point. This is almost universally recognised, and does not demand further demonstration.[4]

[1] Brandt, pp. 317 f. "Das hier Erzählte [war] überhaupt bis dato unbekannt geblieben; . . . kein anderer als der Evangelist selbst hat die Geschichte von dem leeren Grab zum ersten Male erzählt."

[2] Loofs, p. 28.

[3] So Westcott–Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, 1882, p. 46. John 13: 13 is an exception. *Cf.* Burkitt, in *Am. Jour. Theol.*, April, 1911, pp. 172 f.

[4] That Mark originally had the fuller ending is well argued by Korff, pp. 23–26 and Völter, p. 11. Among those who still think that Mark meant to end his gospel with xvi: 8 may be named Brandt, p. 351; O. Holtzmann, p. 389; B. Weiss: Meyer–Weiss, *ad loc.*, and elsewhere; P. W. Schmidt, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, part

A considerable number of scholars have yielded to the very natural temptation and have essayed to reconstruct the lost end of the gospel. For we may regard it as certain that there once existed an ending which is now lost; the hypothesis that Mark was prevented by accident or death from adding anything after the γάρ, and that he or another therefore put the work into circulation in the incomplete shape, need not detain us.[1] Our question therefore is this: What did Mark originally relate concerning events following that Sunday morning which had bearing on Jesus' resurrection and triumph? We have already seen that he must have related the "seeing" of the risen Jesus in Galilee by the disciples and in particular by Peter. Of that we feel very sure; that he related anything beyond that is not rendered necessary by what we read in the extant verses of chapter xvi.

If we ask who is Mark's source of information for this Galilean episode, the answer is, of course: Peter himself, according to Papias's testimony and to intrinsic probability. We should expect a high degree of historicity in the account, therefore, if we could recover it; it would presumably agree with whatever other apparently trustworthy information we might secure on the subject. We have discovered from Paul's testimony—which is valid for Peter's belief as well as for his own—that the risen Jesus had "ap-

---

ii., 1904, p. 122; W. Brückner, in *Prot. Monatshefte*, 1899, pp. 96 f.; Wellhausen, *ad loc.*; Von Soden, *Christliche Welt*, 1908, col. 483.

[1] Among recent upholders of this view may be cited Zahn, *Einleitung*, vol. ii., p. 234, and *Gesch. d. Kan.*, vol. ii., part ii., pp. 930 f. *Cf.* also O. Schmiedel, pp. 49 f., and Holtzmann, *H. C.*, p. 183, *ad loc.*

peared" to Peter first, subsequently to the rest of the Twelve. Not only is the order of the "appearances" fixed by this testimony of Paul's as to what Peter had preached, but their character as well. They are appearances of the glorified Jesus in his spiritual body, in which remains nothing fleshly or earthly, and they are phenomena of *sight only*. "He appeared to Cephas." "There shall ye see him." Neither Paul nor Mark indicates that any sense save that of vision was concerned when the risen Master made himself known. The nature of Jesus' revelations of his risen life, the persons to whom he revealed himself, and in what order, the place in which these revealings were granted, of so much of what Mark once wrote at the end of his gospel, we can be very sure.

And is not this all? Mark can hardly have said more than this, as he certainly cannot have said less.[1] We have here, then, the substance of "the lost end of Mark"; it is only the actual text which is lacking. This text we might conjecturally reconstruct, if it were worth while. The task would be to write in Marcan style and vocabulary a not too long account of how the disciples returned to their Galilean homes, and presumably to their old occupations, which for Peter and a number of the others would be fishing. We would necessarily say some simple words about the

[1] Zahn, *Einleitung*, vol. ii., p. 234, *Gesch. d. Kanons*, vol. ii., part ii., p. 931, curiously conjectures that Mark was meaning to add very much more material; the interruption at xvi: 8 came when he was perhaps "nicht weit über die Mitte" of the book he was planning. Voigt, pp. 78 f., notes, is inclined to adopt this view. So F. C. Burkitt, *Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 1910, pp. 85 f., thinks Mark may have included the story of the first twelve chapters of Acts.

grief and despair of these men, whose life's hope had been crushed at one terrible blow—for we must remember that the women had told them not a word of the events of Sunday morning. To Peter's agony of sorrow and shame there might be special allusion. Then we would describe—it would not be easy—how when Peter is one day sadly engaged in some daily task, most naturally at his fishing, his Master "appears" to him. That scene we would paint in fewest words. Of his joy and of his quick communication of the wonder to his fellow-disciples we would say something, and then recount their sharing of the same blessed vision. With a word as to their ecstasy of joy and faith and their immediate dedication to the apostolic work of proclaiming as Lord and Messiah this Jesus who had been crucified, we might then write: τέλος τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου.[1]

Such an attempt at the reconstruction of the text would, of course, have only conjectural value, but we may, I think, be quite sure that it would embody the substance of what Mark originally wrote, however its wording differed from his. Now it may be at once suggested, and indeed has often been argued, that other extant gospel-documents used Mark as a source before

[1] From the brevity of Mark's whole treatment, and from the great probability, if not certainty, that no conversation or discourse of the risen Master belonged to his account of the original appearances, this reconstruction would not make Mark very much longer than it is with the spurious verses 9–20. It is never the narrative, but always the discourse of Jesus, that gives any length to Mark's episodes. It is of course possible that Mark's account included some brief solemn word of blessing and apostolic charge as spoken by Jesus to the disciples. So Rohrbach, *Schluss*, pp. 23, 52.

his work was mutilated, and that we may therefore find his original ending reproduced in one or another of these. That is an interesting possibility. It raises at once the question: By whom was Mark mutilated, and why? Without here going into this question deeply, the obvious answer is: because Mark's account at this point was not satisfactory to some person or group of persons. The offending portion was therefore removed, perhaps by the simple expedient of detaching the last leaf of papyrus.[1] Then, perhaps by the removers, or, with less probability, by some later Christian who found the gospel circulating in mutilated form, the spurious ending which we know was added.[2]

Now if any gospel writers used Mark in its original form, it would be at an earlier period, when Mark's presentation was still acceptable, or it would be done by so altering or adding to Mark's presentation as to make it acceptable. It is an assured result of the modern critical study of the gospels that Matthew and

[1] This would be the simplest explanation of the break in the middle of a sentence, with γάρ, without giving the object of ἐφοβοῦντο.

[2] Paul Rohrbach, *Schluss des Markusevangeliums*, 1894, gives a very suggestive treatment of this point. *Cf.* also Ad. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 3d and 4th ed., 1901, p. 258; C. R. Gregory, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1909, pp. 415 f.; Joh. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons*, vol. i., 1907, p. 116, note 2; B. W. Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, Introduction, pp. xvii f. Voigt, p. 89, note (*cf.* p. 57), will hardly find converts to his view that a part of the spurious (Ariston) ending of Mark is taken from the original genuine ending. Even more remarkable is the suggestion of F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic and Morals*, 1909, p. 311, that Luke was the one who removed the original Marcan ending!

Luke both used Mark as a source, and that the fourth evangelist knew Mark's work, though writing independently. If we look at the narratives of Matthew and of Luke, we find that their common dependence upon Mark is clear up to the point where the women receive the angelic announcement, that is, up to Mark xvi: 8. Matthew up to xxviii: 8 and Luke up to xxiv: 8 tell a common story; beyond that point they tell an absolutely different story. The reason is either that neither one read anything in Mark beyond xvi: 8, and followed independent sources thereafter, or that one knew and used Mark in complete form, while the other knew only the mutilated form. If we recall the substance of Mark's presentation, as Paul helped us to reconstruct it, we may get some light at this point. Though Mark had come to think that at Jesus' resurrection his body had disappeared from the grave, yet he knew too well from Peter and Paul what had occurred in Galilee, to describe any presence or activities of the buried body there. A man who thinks of the resurrection in the terms of Luke xxiv or John xx might well be wholly dissatisfied with Mark's presentation and be tempted to remove it, or to replace it by an account of more definitely physical phenomena. Certainly the author of neither of these chapters had used Mark's presentation as a source.

But if Luke did not follow Mark's original ending, it is so far possible that Matthew did. Internal evidence may now support or destroy this possibility. A comparison of the text of Mat. xxviii: 8–20 with what we have conjectured as the probable substance of the missing verses in Mark does not tend to convince us that these verses were here followed. Verse 8 is

deliberately altered from Mark xvi: 8; vss. 9 f. cannot have been in Mark, who knew only of appearances to the disciples, and in Galilee. We shall see, moreover, that these verses were almost certainly not originally in Matthew. Vss. 11–15 belong to Matthew's narrative of the guard (xxvii: 62–66), and could not, of course, have been in Mark, which has nothing of that narrative. Vss. 16–20, on the other hand, do relate what Mark must have related, the going of the disciples to Galilee and an appearance of Jesus to them there. But this is told in such a way as to make it almost certain that these five verses do not rest on a use of Mark. "Unto the mountain where Jesus appointed them" has no point of connection with Mark, and the appearance is a single one to the eleven gathered together at a specific place to receive the revelation. Mark's story was rather, as it seems, of two appearances, one to Peter and one to the whole group, appearances, moreover, which came suddenly, to disciples unprepared for them.[1] The lack in Matthew of any mention of Peter, and the full, solemn, theologically advanced address of Jesus (vss. 18 to 20)[2] make it practically certain that here Mark is not the source followed. There is too little that could have come

[1] Korff, p. 30, would deny any special significance to the "and Peter" of the angel's words.

[2] Though the Trinitarian formula in the command to baptise is not Matthew's original phrasing, as has been shown by F. C. Conybeare, *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wiss.*, 1901, pp. 295 ff. *Cf.* Allen, *ad loc.*, and the literature there cited, to which may be added a reply to Conybeare by J. R. Wilkinson, in *Hibbert Journal*, vol. i., p. 571. *Cf.* also Pfleiderer, p. 602; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 76 (Eng. tr., vol. i., 1895, p. 79), note; Martineau, pp. 515 f.; G. H. Gilbert, *Bib. World*, Dec., 1909.

from Mark.[1] The Greek wording, also, does not appear to be reminiscent of Mark's style. The most that can be said is that Matthew has here a confused report of an incident recounted in the original end of Mark, an incident given to Matthew by the tradition.[2]

As to the fourth evangelist, it is clear, as we have seen, that John xx does not reflect anything of the material which was presumably in the missing part of Mark. Its presentation is entirely limited to events in Jerusalem. John xxi, on the other hand, which is so entirely without connection with the solemn close of chapter xx as commonly to be spoken of as an appendix to the gospel, does bring some of the material which Mark must have presented. The likeness to the

[1] Indeed, in this brief notice Matthew is not following any written source, but chronicling an item which the tradition gave to him without fulness of detail.

[2] So Lake, pp. 88–90; Rohrbach, *Schluss*, pp. 24 f., *Berichte*, pp. 21–24. Among those who would find the lost end of Mark in Matthew may be named Holtzmann, *Synoptische Evangelien*, 1863, p. 99 (but *cf. H. C.*, p. 183); Carl Wittichen, in *Jahrbücher für Prot. Theol.*, 1879, pp. 167–173 (this article of Wittichen's is very valuable. *Cf.* his reconstruction of *Urmarkus* in the same journal, 1891, pp. 481 ff.); Keim, p. 567 (Eng. tr., pp. 319 f.) and authors cited in his note; Beyschlag, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, p. 518; Arnold Meyer, p. 28 (less definitely); Voigt, p. 57; Korff, pp. 27–29 (on p. 71 Korff offers a reconstruction of the lost ending, based on the text of Mat.); Allen, *ad loc.* (less definitely); F. H. Chase, in *Jour. Theol. Studies*, vol. vi. (July, 1905), pp. 481–483; T. S. Rördam in *Hibbert Journal*, vol. iii., pp. 769 ff.; E. J. Goodspeed, in *Am. Jour. Theol.*, vol. ix. (1905), p. 484; Staudt, p. 24.

Volkmar, pp. 610 f., offers a reconstruction of the lost passage, based mainly on Matthew, but with elements from Luke and the present "false conclusion." A more eclectic reconstruction, also starting from Matthew, is offered by A. J. Edmunds, in the *Open Court*, vol. xxiv. (1910), pp. 135 f.

Marcan material is much closer than it was in Matthew. We have the return of the disciples to Galilee (assumed), their return to the old occupation of fishing, special mention of Peter and a special meeting between him and the risen Master, followed by a meeting with the entire group of seven disciples who were together fishing. There can be no question that the evangelist is here reproducing in some fulness the material which Mark once contained; the only question is whether he had the complete Marcan text before him, or, like Matthew, is dependent only on the tradition. It is certain that "John" had the three synoptics at his disposal; it is equally certain that he treats them with sovereign independence. Even if he had the complete Mark before him, therefore, he would deal with it with such freedom that we could not feel any confidence in a reconstruction of Mark's text from that of John.

Yet if John xxi seemed with sufficient certainty to contain in some detail the same material as that which Mark once presented, and if its text further showed evidence of being adapted from an earlier written source, we might feel with a high degree of confidence that the author of John xxi knew and used the complete text of Mark. That such is the case has been persuasively argued by Paul Rohrbach,[1] and Bey-

[1] *Schluss*, pp. 41–52; *Berichte*, pp. 40–43, 49–53. Rohrbach's results were accepted by Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 696 f., and have been somewhat more definitely established and carried further by Hans Schmidt, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1907, pp. 487 ff. Similarly, Völter, p. 54. The sharpest critique of Rohrbach's positions came from Beyschlag, who in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1898, pp. 110–115, spoke briefly and with some scorn of the earlier

schlag has not succeeded in making the suggestion seem impossible. The narrative of verses 1 to 14 shows clearly non-Johannine material rewritten by the Johannine pen. The "appearance" of Jesus is plainly his first appearance, though "John" numbers it as the third in order to fit it to the narrative of the preceding chapter. Verses 1, 7, and 14 are the work of the editorial Johannine pen, and the phraseology of verse 8 has been adapted to verse 7.

Can the rest of the narrative, or its substance, have stood in Mark? There seem to be very definite reasons why it cannot have stood there, despite the pertinence of Rohrbach's arguments. In the first place, there is lacking any specific appearance to Peter alone, at some time prior to the appearance to the rest. Such prior appearance is demanded by Paul's ὤφθη Κηφᾷ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα, and if Peter were Mark's informant, must have been so described by Mark. The statement in vs. 7 that Peter cast himself into the sea, obviously that he might first reach the land and approach Jesus, is, indeed, probably a reminiscence of the tradition of Peter's priority in seeing the risen Master, but the narrative here, with or without vs. 7, is surely not the narrative of Mark. There is but one appearance, and that to only six disciples besides Peter; we may reduce Paul's δώδεκα to eleven, but not easily to seven. And the story is too detailed and circumstantial to have been the story which Peter told Mark of his own experience and that of his fellow-disciples. The Jesus who stands on the shore and tells the fishers, out of his supernatural

monograph, and in the same journal, 1899, pp. 507 ff., offered a refutation of the *Berichte* in detail.

knowledge (it is surely meant so) where to cast their nets, the Jesus who fetches bread and fish, who kindles a fire and cooks a breakfast and serves it to the disciples, is not the Jesus of Peter's "seeing," but a very material figure, such as the later thought loved to conceive. John xxi rests on a source which aimed to give a picture of the "appearance" to the disciples in Galilee,[1] but that source was not Mark. Its picture is not Mark's, though the episode it would describe is ultimately an episode recounted by Mark.[2] We shall later return to John xxi.

We have failed to find any certain indications of the use in our canonical gospels of the original end of Mark, although we find transcriptions of the "appearance" to the disciples which Mark must have attested. It is possible that some apocryphal gospel or patristic document may preserve something of the text for which we are searching. The only such document that can have any claim to be seriously considered here is the Gospel of Peter. That this work actually

[1] This appearance was, as Rohrbach points out, conceived by the author of John's source here as the first after the resurrection. No appearance to Peter has preceded it, though there is the reminiscence in vs. 7 of Peter's special prominence on this occasion. It would be, of course, the only appearance to the group of disciples; Paul's list indicates that only once did they see the risen Jesus. Peter, in distinction from the others, had apparently two visions, one alone and one with the others.

[2] So H. H. Wendt, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1900, p. 229. A. Stülcken, in Hennecke's *Handbuch*, p. 88, thinks it "möglich" that John xxi gives an "Überarbeitung des Stoffes, der am Schlusse des Mc.-Evangeliums erzählt werden sollte und vielleicht erzählt wurde." *Cf. infra*, Chapter XIV., for further treatment of John xxi and its sources.

used as a source Mark in its complete form, and keeps for us something of the lost Marcan ending, was suggested by Harnack, in his edition of the Gospel of Peter.[1] The suggestion was taken up by his pupil Rohrbach,[2] and argued at length and with much plausibility. There is much to be said for it. For "Peter's" account of the resurrection, Mark xvi: 1–8 is very clearly the source, as far as it goes. What follows is a direct continuation, without perceptible break or change of style, as if from one source to another. The phraseology has something in common with Mark; for example, Ev. Petri has "Levi the son of Alphæus" who is so called only in Mk. ii: 14, whereas the Lucan parallel has Levi, and the Matthean Matthew, both without patronymic. "We the twelve disciples" accords with I. Cor. xv: 5, the only canonical passage where "the Twelve" is used for the disciples after Judas's defection,[3] and with Mark's usage, who has the title eleven times to Matthew's eight and Luke's seven, though so much shorter than the latter gospels.

But more important, Pseudo-Peter contains precisely such statements as Mark must have made, as we may see from the following passage, which immediately succeeds the statement of the women's

[1] *T. und U.*, vol. ix., part ii., 1893, p. 33. *Cf. Chronologie*, p. 696.

[2] *Schluss*, pp. 26–33; *Berichte*, pp. 13 f., 43–49. *Cf.* also Hans Schmidt, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1907, pp. 494–496; Korff, p. 92; Lake, p. 162; F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 310 f.; Völter, p. 50. Against the view of Harnack and Rohrbach *cf.* especially Beyschlag, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1898, p. 112, and 1899, pp. 521 f.; also Stülcken in Hennecke's *Handbuch*, pp. 87 f.

[3] John xx: 24, Acts vi: 2, and Rev. xxi: 14 are of course not exceptions. I. Cor. xv: 5 reproduces the "Petrine" tradition.

flight from the tomb. "Now it was the last day of the unleavened bread, and many went forth returning to their homes, as the feast was ended. But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, mourned and were grieved: and each one grieving for that which was come to pass departed to his home. But I Simon Peter and Andrew my brother took our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us Levi the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord. . . . "[1] Here our extant fragment of the text breaks off as abruptly as does our text of Mark, in the midst of a sentence. But we have here the disciples' grief, their return to Galilee (clearly not having received any message from the women), their renewal of the old life, and we would surely have, if the fragment were longer, an appearance of Jesus to Peter as he was fishing in the lake, and to a group of other disciples as well, perhaps at the same time with Peter, perhaps separately. This is surely the substance of the lost end of Mark. And we find it in a "gospel" bearing the name of Peter himself as author, and therefore purporting to give the authentic Petrine tradition. The date of this apocryphal work cannot be fixed with certainty. Harnack argues for 110–130,[2] Stülcken for about 150,[3] Swete for somewhat later, preferably about 165.[4] The question of date is complicated by the

[1] Translation from J. Armitage Robinson, in *The Gospel According to Peter, and the Revelation of Peter*, 1892.

[2] *Chronologie*, p. 622. *Cf.* also p. 474.

[3] Hennecke's *Handbuch*, p. 79.

[4] H. B. Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, 1893, p. xlv. For other dates assigned *cf. The Gospel of Peter. A Study.* By the author of *Supernatural Religion*, 1894, p. 43. The present writer is inclined toward one of the later dates suggested, such as Swete's.

uncertainty as to Justin's acquaintance with the work, but it is not here of vital importance. The average date assigned is about the middle of the century, and that we may accept as near enough for our purposes.

Now just this date makes it difficult to believe, as Beyschlag somewhat scornfully urged, that the author had before him an unmutilated copy of Mark. Even if we should accept Harnack's average date of 120, we should still be a half-century after the writing of Mark, while the more probable date of 150 would bring us to a point eighty years after Mark wrote. Even a century may easily lie between the two works. But be it a century or half a century, or any intermediate period, it is extremely unlikely that in Syria, the probable home of Pseudo-Peter, a manuscript of Mark in its complete form was still to be found. For Matthew, a quarter-century or little more after Mark's time, knew only the mutilated Mark, and Luke, not much, if any, later, although he had "traced the course of all things accurately from the first," and was acquainted with many works offering a transcript of the gospel, also had nothing in Mark beyond xvi: 8. Rohrbach has really not made his case very plausible at this point, though he has put Pseudo-Peter as close as possible to the year 100.[1] Harnack declared in 1893,[2] "*A strict* proof that the canonical gospels are made use of cannot be brought, even for Mark, although the using is very probable. It is possible that the Gospel of Peter, without standing in a direct literary relationship to our gospels, drew from the same flow of tra-

[1] *Berichte*, pp. 48 f. *Cf.* Beyschlag, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, pp. 521 f.

[2] In his edition of Ev. Petri, *T. u. U.*, vol. ix., p. 79.

dition and legendary development, only partially fixed in writing as yet, as did they—that it did not even use Mark, but Mark's source (*Urmarcus?*)." In 1897 Harnack had properly grown more confident that the gospels themselves were used,[1] but if there is room for *any* doubt that use was made of texts we have before us, we cannot feel any certainty that use was made of a text whose general content, only, can be conjectured, and whose very existence is doubted by many.

Besides these general considerations that make it doubtful whether Pseudo-Peter knew Mark in its complete form, there is an argument from the Greek text itself. The last words of the angel to the women are: ἀνέστη γὰρ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖ ὅθεν ἀπεστάλη, which words are substituted for Mark's bidding (xvi: 7), "Go say to his disciples and Peter: He goes before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him as he told you." In the Gosp. Pet. there is no message to the disciples at all, and of course no statement of the non-delivery of such message. The women did not tell the disciples of their discovery, indeed, but neither had they been bidden to do so. According to Mark the form that is missing from the tomb is on its way (προάγει) to Galilee; according to Pseudo-Peter it is already in heaven (ἀπῆλθον) whence it was sent. The latter phrase is, as Harnack pointed out, Johannine, and posits a different point of view from that of Mark.[2] The appearance of Jesus which "Peter" is about to

[1] *Chronologie*, p. 622. On this point *cf.* W. Sanday, *Inspiration* (Bampton Lectures for 1893), 4th impression, 1901, pp. 310 f., as also the various editions of Ev. Petri.

[2] *Cf.* Luke iv: 43, ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην as contrasted with its source in Mk. 1: 38, εἰς τοῦτο ἐξῆλθον.

describe, therefore, we may reasonably conjecture to be an appearance in glory from heaven, perhaps analogous to the accounts of Paul's Christophany in Acts. The description of the resurrection itself would lead us to expect something of the sort, striking and spectacular. We read (using Dr. Swete's translation) of "three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Thou didst preach to them that sleep; and a response was heard from the cross, Yea."[1] It would seem probable, therefore, that though the general framework of the story in Pseudo-Peter—return of disciples to Galilee and their former occupation, appearance of Jesus to them, and notably to Peter—is the same as that of Mark's lost section, "Peter" told the story itself in quite a different fashion. The text of Mark, at least, cannot be recovered from the apocryphal fragment, nor with confidence be assumed to have been before its author.

The phrase immediately following the one already quoted (the angel's words) seems further to indicate quite clearly that the Mark used by the apocryphal writer ended with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. The latter words are clearly not only not the end of a book, but also not the end of a paragraph or section, or what would correspond to a chapter in modern books. They are not, indeed, the end of a sentence. We are forced to conjecture an object of ἐφοβοῦντο, such

[1] This last sentence is somewhat obscure, and has been translated in several different ways, but the general sense is clear.

as "the chief priests and the elders." Jesus has been brought to death by his Jewish enemies; in the event of his escaping from that death the natural fear is of the enemies' vengeance.[1] Most expositors seem to interpret the fear here as the τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις which had fallen on the women, but that would not be lasting, and Mark plainly means a fear that kept the women's lips sealed at least until the disciples had learned, from his appearance, that Jesus was risen.[2] Some word or words, then, stood originally as the object of ἐφοβοῦντο in Mark xvi: 8, probably words descriptive of Jesus' enemies of the Sanhedrin. But Pseudo-Peter has no sign of any such object. Its corresponding sentence is much briefer than Mark's, and has something of the latter's abruptness. Mark has καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον . . . ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. "Peter" has τότε αἱ γυναῖκες φοβηθεῖσαι ἔφυγον. In both the principal verb is ἔφυγον; in both the qualifying verb is a form of φοβέομαι. But "Peter" has made this verb an aorist participle, "because they had been frightened," plainly by the angel in the open tomb. He interprets Mark's ἐφοβοῦντο, in other words, precisely as modern exegetes do, who have no text beyond γάρ. And that although he omits any reference to the τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις of which Mark speaks, and indeed, gives no explanation at all why the women should be frightened. Mark's ἐφοβοῦντο, imperfect, is meant to carry the fear forward over the later weeks or months. "They said

[1] *Cf.* F. C. Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, 1901, p. 28. T. S. Rōrdam, in *Hibbert Journal*, vol. iii., p. 779, suggests "feared that it might not be so," which seems improbable in the context, especially since the messenger is a supernatural visitant.

[2] So Rohrbach, *Berichte*, p. 19; Lake, pp. 71 f.

not a word to any one, for they were in constant terror of the Sanhedrin," is his thought. The sentence in Pseudo-Peter is a reforming of the sentence in Mark, but of the sentence as ending with γάρ.

Further, a comparison of the vocabulary of the concluding section of the Petrine fragment with that of Mark does not afford any real evidence of dependence. The following characteristic words are not found in Mark: τελευταία (not in N. T.), ὑποστρέφοντες (not the true reading in Mk. xiv: 40), παυσαμένης, Σίμων Πέτρος (despite Mk. iii: 16 and xiv: 37), λίνα. The title Κύριος (here without the article) is used of Jesus in Mark only in xi: 3. So far as the vocabulary of Pseudo-Peter reflects the canonical gospels at all, it is closest to the phraseology of Luke and John. The agreements with Mark are in very usual and familiar words, common also to the other evangelists. Of course we must except the phrase already noted, Λευεῖς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, found only in Mk. ii: 14, and perhaps the expression οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί may have some Marcan tendency. But neither indicates at most anything more than familiarity with Mark as we know it, and that is certain in any case.

We may conclude, therefore, that the author of the Gospel of Peter used, among other sources, Mark as we have it, ending at xvi: 8, and a further narrative of the appearance of Jesus to his disciples in Galilee. This latter narrative reproduced, in its own way, the account of that event which Mark originally described, and may, directly or indirectly, rest on Mark's lost conclusion. It would be strange if absolutely no literary use had been made of Mark in the early days, before its mutilation. At least we may assume that

the memory of what Mark had originally written would persist in the minds of those who had read it or heard it read, and that some of its details would reappear in other accounts. All that our examination of other gospels has made reasonably certain is that the authors of neither Matthew, Luke, John, or "Peter" had before them the unmutilated Mark and made direct use of the text of its closing portion.

That certain elements of Mark's account came mediately to these authors, and were used by them, seems, however, equally clear. To take an example of minor importance, we have already conjectured as altogether probable that Mark's unfinished sentence originally named, as object of the verb ἐφοβοῦντο, the Jewish enemies of Jesus who were responsible for his arrest and death. The Gospel of Peter, in its account of the coming of the women to the tomb, has in three different places the statement that they were very much afraid of being attacked and punished by the Jews, insomuch that they must move secretly and with caution. They had been unable to anoint his body, or even to "weep and bewail him on the day when he was crucified," and now they will attempt to perform these last offices of love, if they may escape observation. The phrases are: "Mary Magdalene . . . afraid by reason of the Jews, forasmuch as they were inflamed with wrath" (φοβουμένη διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ἐπειδὴ ἐφλέγοντο ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς); "And they feared lest the Jews should see them" (ἐφόβοῦντο μὴ ἴδωσιν αὐτὰς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι); "We fear lest any man see us" (φοβούμεθα μή τις ἡμᾶς ἴδῃ). That threefold statement has undoubtedly some source besides the author's own reflection, and this source is most probably *ultimately* the

statement of Mark, mediated to "Peter" through the document from which he drew his account of the disciples' experience in Galilee.[1]

The grief of the disciples, their fishing excursion, perhaps the names of those present, may be further elements of the Petrine account which were originally Mark's. The fact that John xxi gives the names of the disciples who had together gone fishing may also suggest that Mark once offered such a list.[2] The list in John and that in "Peter" may be compared. John gives: Simon Peter, Thomas Didymus, Nathanael of Cana, the sons of Zebedee, and two others unnamed, seven in all, of whom one is later (xxi: 7) identified with the mysterious "disciple whom Jesus loved." "Peter" gives: Simon Peter, Andrew his brother, Levi. Here the fragment breaks off, but it is at least as probable that the names of other disciples followed as that Levi was the last. There is no *a priori* reason why Andrew and Levi might not be the two unnamed disciples in John, or why Thomas, Nathanael and the sons of Zebedee might not have followed in Pseudo-Peter. Nathanael, to be sure, is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, where Matthew (or Levi), on the contrary, is never named. It has been suggested[3] that Nathanael is John's equivalent for Matthew, since Μαθθαῖος is the transliteration of a Hebrew

[1] There may be a reminiscence of the same statement in John xix: 38, xx: 19, "for fear of the Jews," though here the phrase refers respectively to Joseph and to the disciples. There is no probability that the Gosp. Pet. is dependent on these Johannine passages.

[2] But *cf. infra*, pp. 414 f.

[3] By Hilgenfeld, Resch, Völter (p. 54), and others. *Cf. Encyc. Biblica.* art. "Nathanael" and Schmiedel, col. 4047, note 3.

name meaning: gift of Jahweh, and Ναθαναήλ in Hebrew is: God has given. In the synoptic lists of the Twelve (Mk. iii: 18; Mat. x: 3; Lk. vi: 15) the names of Matthew and Thomas are coupled, as here in John xxi: 2 those of Thomas and Nathanael. If Nathanael were indeed John's substitute for Levi the son of Alphæus, there would be still greater probability that Mark originally gave such a list of disciples together when the Lord appeared. But if so, the list must have been longer than either John's or Pseudo-Peter's, and in truth this identification is obviously too hypothetical and precarious to have any evidential weight.

We have not found the text of Mark's lost conclusion. But we have learned the substance of it, and we have found several presentations of its chief episode, which witness to the original presence and influence of that text, though having only mediate relation to it. These are Mat. xxviii: 16–20; John xxi: 1–14; Gosp. Pet. Of these three, the last shows most Marcan character, Matthew least. To these must be added a fourth presentation of the same episode, that in Luke v: 1–11, which will concern us later. Here also belongs Paul's brief word in I. Cor. xv: 5, written of course long before Mark's gospel.

This word of Paul's, ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα, is linked by ὅτι το παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον; it was plainly a fixed part of the Christian παράδοσις, one of the first things (ἐν πρώτοις) to be declared to a group of converts. These "appearances" were, that is, of fundamental importance, and never failed to be recounted. The other appearances cited by Paul have not this dependence on the preceding verbs,

and do not seem to have had the same fixed place in the preaching; Paul adds them to make his demonstration as convincing as possible.[1] This old message, which the Twelve had proclaimed in the first years of the Church, and Paul after them, how the risen Master had appeared to Peter in Galilee, forgiving his sin, removing his shame, setting him apart to the apostleship, then with similar consecrating power to his ten colleagues—this old gospel, without which there is no gospel, naturally, inevitably, found a place in Mark's transcript of the Christian proclamation. Removed thence, overshadowed by another tradition, it did not yet wholly disappear, but left numerous traces of itself, as the message proclaimed at the first.

But Mark's presentation is not limited to the substance of this old gospel; there is something new. It is the report that three women had, on the third day after Jesus' death, found his tomb open, his body gone, and an angel within who announced his resurrection and departure for Galilee, startling news which the women had divulged to no one, owing to their fear of the Jewish authorities. This story, coming to Mark we know not how, he has accepted and here gives it currency by writing it in his gospel. Though not a part of the old message, it fits into the old message as a preliminary to those "appearances" in Galilee of which Peter had told. So far as Mark can tell, it was never known to the disciples, to Paul, or to the Christian teachers prior to his own time.

This new element in Mark's summary of the Christian message we must now examine more in detail, and

[1] So Rohrbach, *Berichte*, p. 2; Beyschlag, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, p. 509; Hans Schmidt, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1907, p. 493.

inquire as to its historical character. We have seen that it was unknown to the apostles of the earlier time; the women, not the apostles, are its ultimate source, and to Mark it has come but lately, not from the women directly, but through oral tradition. Even if we should grant, for the moment, that it had been known to the apostles, and that Jesus' resurrection and appearance to them meant, in their minds, that his body issued from the grave, came to Galilee and there was seen, yet for them the women's story is a matter of quite subordinate importance. This was no experience of theirs, but only something of which they had later heard, as had Mark. It was no appearance of Jesus, but only a declaration that he is no longer in the tomb and will appear to them. What is this experience of the women compared to their own experience in Galilee, when they saw him for themselves and were assured of his living presence? Granting that when they returned to Jerusalem, some time after the "appearances," joyfully declaring that they had seen the risen Jesus, they had been told by the women, now grown bolder, "Yes, we knew he was risen, an angel declared it to us on the third day after his death, but we have feared until now to tell,"—granting this, of what importance is that tardy confession now, when Jesus has been with his disciples amid the old scenes?[1] To imagine them searching the tomb for confirmation of the women's story is to suppose them unconvinced by their own experience of seeing the Master, even if it were not too late to establish the identity of a corpse which the grave might contain, or to demonstrate infallibly that only by resurrection could the grave now

[1] *Cf.* Clemen, p. 203, last sentence on page.

be tenantless. But in truth we cannot imagine its even occurring to the disciples to undertake such investigation or demonstration, on any theory of their conception of resurrection.[1]

[1] *Cf.* Schmiedel, art. "Gospels," *Encyc. Biblica*, vol. ii., cols. 1880 f.

CHAPTER VI

WHO SHALL ROLL AWAY THE STONE?

IF there seems less certain attestation for the episode of the women's experience at the grave than for most of Mark's material, the details of the narrative itself are such as to suggest legend rather than a transcript of actual fact. To begin with, the women's errand is scarcely probable. The body has been wrapped in a grave-cloth and buried; the grave is sealed with its stone. It is late for anointing, in the climate of Jerusalem, when a body has been already two nights and a day in its grave. We may not unreasonably doubt the probability of friends disinterring (that is really what would be done) a once buried body, even though the rites of sepulture had been hasty and incomplete. Jewish feeling concerning the uncleanness of a corpse would furnish a strong presumption against the probability of such a procedure. And this is a body buried not by themselves or any one with whom they have relations, and in a tomb not their property. Surely Keim is right, "Neither the burier nor the prevailing usage would allow of any supplementary act after the sepulture had been completed and the stone finally placed before the grave."[1]

The stone is in more senses than one an insuperable

[1] Keim, p. 522 (Eng. tr., p. 268). He adds in a footnote, "*It was an absolute rule* that the grave should not be opened again,

difficulty; women who had seen the interment would surely not have brought their spices and come to anoint the body on the bare chance of there being fortuitous passers-by who would assist them to remove the stone. The problem offered by the stone apparently does not occur to them until they approach the grave, when we find them discussing it, else they were not there without some means for its removal. This μέγας σφόδρα λίθος, sufficient to close the door of a roomy tomb, is not to be removed by any critical expedients; as the evangelists saw, if it is rolled away at all, it must be by angelic power. The stone, then, is strong evidence against the women's errand. And one has only to picture the scene to see its complete lack of verisimilitude; what, for example, would be the state of mind of the chance passer-by, (a Jew!) thus appealed to? Is it at all normal or natural that he would accede to the request of a group of strange women that he would open a closed grave for them, as a matter of accommodation? Is that a probable request, and if it were made, what would be the probable response? The opening of tombs where dead men lie is no such simple matter. Moreover, the opening by a group of women of the tomb of a man, buried the day before yesterday, is hardly a matter of course. One does not wish to press the argument from propriety, but it is not amiss to refer to it.[1]

---

postea quam lapide sepulcrali clausum est, see Buxt., p. 438." The reference to Buxtorf I have been unable to verify, but the note seems important, and to correspond with the overwhelming probability as to Hebrew usage. *Cf.* also Wellhausen *ad* Mark xvi: 2.

[1] *Cf.* Ulysse Chevalier, in *Revue Biblique Internationale*, vol. xi. (1902), p. 569, note 3.

As a matter of fact, the difficulty of the women's errand was felt by practically every later user of this narrative. Matthew (xxviii: 1), with apparently a keen sense of what was possible in the Palestinian environment, *having Mark's statement before him*, deliberately omits any allusion to the intended anointing, any suggestion that the women hoped to open the tomb, saying, instead, that the women came merely "to see the sepulchre." John (xix: 39 f.) has the anointing already done by Joseph and Nicodemus, with no suggestion that the women thought of performing this service. Pseudo-Peter substitutes, by curious circumlocutions, something else for the women's purpose to anoint. The passage is interesting. "Mary Magdalene . . . had not done at the sepulchre of the Lord *what women are wont to do for those who die and are dear to them* . . . took with her her female friends, and came to the sepulchre where He was laid. And they feared lest the Jews should see them, and they said, Although *we could not weep and bewail Him* on the day when He was crucified, *let us do so now* at His sepulchre. But who shall roll us away the stone which was laid at the door of the sepulchre, that *we may enter in and sit by Him*, and do the things that are due? for the stone was great, and we fear lest any man see us. And if we cannot, even though we should cast at the door the *things which we bring for a memorial of Him*, we will weep and bewail him until we come to our house."[1] Mark was before the writer of this passage, yet the women are said to intend, not to anoint the body, but to pay it the tribute of

[1] Swete's translation. Italics mine.

tears and lamentation and to leave votive offerings at the tomb. Luke, also, though he repeats from Mark the buying and bringing of the spices (xxiii: 56, xxiv: 1), yet does not say with what purpose this was done, or state the intention of opening the tomb. Mark's suggestion of the stone as a source of perplexity he entirely passes over, as he has previously omitted to mention the placing of the stone at the tomb-door. It is only inference or memory of Mark that finds in Luke the women's intention to remove the stone and to enter the tomb to anoint the body. Only our familiarity with Mark and our unconscious harmonisation of texts prevent our noticing this awkward hiatus in Luke's account. The stone is mentioned only at the point where the women note its absence from the door of the sepulchre; even its heaviness, emphasised by Mark, Luke leaves unnoted. It may be observed, in passing, that the phrase ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα clearly ought to come before Mark xvi: 4, not after it. It grounds the women's question how the stone may be removed, not their perception that it has been removed. Here it stands in the Sinaitic Syriac version, in Codex D, and certain other manuscripts, and here the author of Pseudo-Peter evidently read it.[1]

The women, then, did not go to the tomb to anoint the body. Nor can they have gone, as Matthew thought more plausible, merely to see the sepulchre.

[1] *Cf.* Brandt, p. 315; Rohrbach: *Berichte*, p. 45; author of "Supernatural Religion," *The Gospel According to Peter*, 1894, p. 98; J. M. S. Baljon, *Commentaar op het Evangelie van Markus*, 1906, p. 270. For the common reading, Wellhausen, *ad loc.*, and Lake, p. 56 (top).

Left without motive, they surely did not go at all. But if their errand lacks verisimilitude, still more so does the discovery they make on their arrival. The stone is rolled away; who has done it? Matthew says (xxviii: 2), "An angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it." Mark and Luke leave something similar to be inferred, or possibly think of the superhuman power of the revived Jesus as thrusting away the stone from within.[1] The critics do not accept Matthew's statement; they do not believe in angels; yet their explanations of the stone's removal are scarcely more credible than his. In vain have they ascribed to Joseph of Arimathea, to the disciples, to the hostile Jews, to the (naturally) reviving Jesus, this momentous activity. It has not been difficult for the defenders of the supernatural narrative to demonstrate lack of motive, or of ability, or of opportunity, in the case of each of these supposed removers of the stone; and the later course of the narrative, as well as the question of the body's further fate, would seem to make it infinitely more likely that the stone was not rolled away than that any such secret and deceptive and motiveless activity went on.

This conclusion is only strengthened by the continuation of the narrative. Half of the episode in Mark (vss. 5–7) is commonly rejected outright by critics, not on any critical grounds that separate it from the context, but solely because they do not be-

[1] So Wellhausen *ad* Mk. xvi: 4 and Arnold Meyer, pp. 29, 33. Origen (*Contra Cels.*, v., 58) suggests that Jesus and the angel together removed the stone. Tertullian (*Apol.* 21) says it was moved by the earthquake. In the Ev. Petri, it moves of itself.

lieve in angels.[1] As a matter of fact, the whole centre and heart of the episode in Mark is *what the women see and hear inside the tomb;* their observance of the displaced stone is quite secondary. To assume, as is so frequently done, that the women found the tomb open and vacant, and to make this empty tomb the one central and historically true element in the narrative, is nothing less than violence to the sources. They know of no empty tomb; they know only of an angel-tenanted tomb, from the lips of whose celestial occupants comes the message that becomes the basis of Christian preaching and begins a new epoch in the world's life.[2]

Remove the angel from Mark's account, and the whole narrative falls to the ground; the angel alone gives it point and coherence. Every element is expressly related to the angel. How is the stone removed? By the angel. Mark's emphasis on its exceeding size serves to indicate a more than mortal power as its remover.[3] As the women enter the tomb, what do they see? "A young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe." Do they note for themselves the absence of Jesus' body? No, from the angel they learn that the Master has left the tomb,

[1] So, for example, Völter, pp. 10 and 27.

[2] Of course at certain moments (Lk. xxiv: 3; John xx: 5–8) the tomb appears empty, but in all the gospels angels (one or two) are seen within or at the entrance, and their message is the chief point of the narrative.

[3] It is quite clear that Matthew understood Mark correctly here. The idea of an angel as the opener of doors to let out those confined is sufficiently common (*cf.* Acts v: 19, xii: 7–10), and Mark's idea of Jesus' resurrection-body scarcely ascribes to it power to remove such great weight of matter.

they learn all that they know of the resurrection.[1] From him they receive the message which, if actually given, would be of supreme importance, but which, as it fits into Mark's narrative, is deprived of any significance whatever, because it is not delivered until other events have made its repetition unnecessary. Why are the women "amazed"? Naturally enough, at the sight of the angel. Why do they flee from the tomb? Not to deliver their message, but simply because "trembling and astonishment had come upon them" before the angelic visitant.

Thus without the angel there is practically no content at all to Mark's narrative; the stone is not removed, the grave is not certified as empty, the women are ignorant of what has happened. It is impossible, on any legitimate critical grounds, to select in Mark's account the one element of the empty tomb, and reject the rest as inseparably connected with the angel.[2] Verse 4 leaves the women standing in surprise at the sight of the displaced stone. What then, if the following

[1] This consideration is strengthened if, with Cod. Vat., we read ἐλθοῦσαι in vs. 5 and omit the ἐξελθοῦσαι in vs. 8. Then there would be no direct statement that the women themselves saw the interior of the tomb, or had any assurance that the body was gone except the angel's words. *Cf.* Lake, pp. 62–65, and for εἰσελθοῦσαι, Völter, pp. 5 f.

[2] *Cf.* A. K. Rogers, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*, 1894, p. 332. Maurenbrecher, p. 32, describes Mark's narrative as "eine Geschichte in der der Engel nicht nur Staffage ist, sondern im entscheidenden Mittelpunkt der Handlung steht."

In this connection one may properly quote a sentence from Adolf Hausrath, *Jesus und die neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller*, 1909, vol. ii., p. 43, "Die Erzählungen ihrer wunderbaren Bestandteile zu entkleiden und dann den Rest für historisch auszugeben, hat früher nicht für Kritik gegolten."

verses do not picture historical fact? We cannot leave them standing there; something must have happened next. Or shall we rescue verse 8*a*, as having no direct mention of the angel, and see them fleeing in bewilderment and terror from the tomb? But what has occurred in the interim? Some striking experience they must have had, to account for their trembling and astonishment. Is it merely that they have entered the tomb and found no body? Bewildered terror is hardly the emotion that discovery would be likely to call forth; still this construction may be granted as a conceivable one. But we still have the insoluble questions: Who had removed the stone? What had become of the body? As for verse 8*b*, it clearly refers to the non-delivery of the angelic message; only in a stress might it be construed to fit the construction which omits the angel.

But in truth the episode without the angel is a completely emasculated one, and one which never existed in the tradition. A moment's reflection should convince us that the story of the women's discovery was never told without including the angelic visitor and his message; only in these lies the faintest excuse for telling it at all. It is told because it embodies the Easter-message of resurrection, as voiced by the angel, and nothing is clearer than that merely finding the Master's grave open and the body gone would never have given the finders that message. In fact, what actually first gave that message was Jesus' appearance to Peter in Galilee, and only a violent recourse to angels could transfer the annunciation to the tomb in Jerusalem and the third day.

No, Mark's narrative has no point without the

angel and his message. Any attempt to conserve it without these must inevitably fail, as entirely foreign to the original purport of the narrative. And it must be a real angel and a real resurrection-message. The most plausible attempt to conserve the form of the narrative while excising all that gives it any excuse for being, has been made by Professor Lake.[1] He suggests that the women were so confused and troubled in mind at the time they watched Jesus' burial, and stood at such a distance, that they had "but a limited power to distinguish between one rock-tomb and another close to it." As a consequence, the simple explanation of the whole story is that they came to the wrong tomb on the Sunday morning. "They expected to find a closed tomb, but they found an open one; and a young man who was in the entrance, guessing their errand, tried to tell them that they had made a mistake in the place. 'He is not here,' said he; 'see the place where they laid him,' and probably pointed to the next tomb." This construction of the young man's words is assisted if the reading of Codex D is adopted, οὐκ ἐστιν ὧδε, ἴδετε ἐκεῖ (τὸν) τόπον αὐτοῦ ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν.[2] "But the women were frightened at the detection of their errand and fled, only imperfectly or not at all understanding what they had heard. It was only later on, when they knew that the Lord was risen and—on their view—that his tomb must be empty, that they came to believe that the young man was something more than they had seen; that he was not telling them of their mistake, but announcing the Resurrection, and that his intention was to give them a message for the disciples."

[1] Lake, pp. 250–252.

[2] Lake, pp. 68 f.

Professor Lake urges that "these remarks are not to be taken as anything more than a suggestion of what might possibly have happened." As a suggestion, it is interesting, but it can hardly be made really plausible.[1] The premise that the women mistook the grave, though two of them, at least, had seen the burial, and they must, under the circumstances, have carefully noted it, is too convenient to be very convincing. There appears no hesitation as to the identification of the grave; the moment the stone becomes visible lying at one side, that moment the Master's grave is recognised as open. One might conceive an agitation of mind which would make both women uncertain as to the exact location of the tomb they sought; not so easily one which should make both certain of the same tomb, and that the wrong one.

And the young man who by chance is standing in the defiling precincts of this tomb, who recognises at once the women and their errand, knows more accurately than themselves the location of their Master's tomb, kindly points them out its rock-covered door, as they stand feeble and trembling before him, yet fails, though knowing their errand, to offer assistance in forcing an entrance—this is hardly a matter-of-fact young citizen of Jerusalem, taking the air in so extraordinary a place at sunrise, and so strangely well informed.

Moreover, if the women "only imperfectly or not at all" understood what they heard, how comes it that we have the report of the exact words (whether in the Bezan or the common text), words which the women who heard and reported them wholly misinterpreted,

[1] *Cf.* the criticism by Orr, pp. 130 f.

but which Professor Lake correctly understands? If they understood what they heard not at all, or even imperfectly, then the words as we have them must be in substance the product of the women's imagination. If so, their form is shaped by the women's (mistaken) theory of the resurrection, and their meaning is what Mark means, not what Professor Lake means. We would have, by hypothesis, not what was actually said by the young man, but what the women, believing him to have been an angel announcing the resurrection, supposed he must have said. But if he did not say these words, in close substance, then Professor Lake's theory falls to the ground, for its only basis is in the form of the words. No essential change could be made in the form of the sentence without destroying the hypothesis. "You are looking for Jesus, the crucified Nazarene; he is not here; look, there is the spot where they placed him." The suggestion seems therefore to contain its own refutation, since to give it any foundation, so much must have been accurately heard and reported.

It is not too much to suppose that if these words had been spoken by an ordinary young man, and if, moreover, he had made his absolutely plain words plainer yet by pointing to the next tomb, the women would not have done what Professor Lake describes them as doing. This friendly young man is the very person they were looking for when they questioned, "Who shall roll away the stone?" Why "frightened at the detection of their errand"? Could they induce the first casual man they might meet to open a tomb for them without revealing the nature of their errand? What is there in these commonplace, friendly, reassur-

ing words to send them flying from the place in bewilderment and terror so great that their lips were sealed for weeks or months, as over some terrible secret? What is there in this young man that makes them later picture him as an angel from heaven, and while remembering so accurately the one sentence he *did* say, add to it, by an act of imaginative memory, certain specific and detailed phrases which he *did not say* at all? These phrases are "Be not amazed—he is risen —go tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." Is it not perfectly impossible that women, having the experience Professor Lake suggests, should ever have remembered, or imagined, that these latter phrases had been said to them by the young man? But if these words are the creation of tradition, embodying an erroneous conception of the resurrection, so are the rest. In truth, the angel's words are of one piece; it is hopeless to attempt to divide them into words actually spoken, and words imagined.

If I have thus at some length pointed out a lack of verisimilitude in Professor Lake's suggestion, it is not in order to depreciate his exceedingly valuable discussion. It is only in order to show, by a criticism of this, the most plausible of hypotheses which treat the episode as historic but wholly non-miraculous, that the episode cannot be so treated. The criticism could be carried into further detail, but enough has been said to show how completely the incident is a unity, how hopeless it is to attempt to pick and choose elements in it which once existed as independent historical traditions, only later gathering to themselves the legendary and miraculous features. The narrative and its

separate parts always existed in relation to each other, and bore the meaning which they bear on their face now, which they bore to the earliest readers of the Gospel of Mark.[1]

One further point demands discussion in connection with the angel's message. The words, "there shall ye see him, as he said unto you," plainly refer back to some earlier declaration on the part of Jesus that his disciples should "see" him (in Galilee?) after his death. Such a declaration is found plainly written in our present text of Mk. xiv: 28. On the way to Gethsemane, Jesus declares his conviction that the disciples shall be "offended," which he elucidates by quoting (from Zech. xiii: 7), "I will smite the Shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad." To this declaration he adds, "Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee." This is not precisely, to be sure, a promise that they should *see him* in Galilee, though this might be considered implied. At any rate, the latter promise is given in addition to the other in the angel's words in xvi: 7, προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. Here the καθὼς εἶπεν seems to relate primarily to the ὄψεσθε αὐτόν, whereas the promise of xiv: 28 agrees with the preceding clause. A reproduction of the one passage by the other is certain; xiv: 28 has προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλ.,

[1] Latham, pp. 400–419, argues that the white-robed men seen at the tomb are not angels, but young students from a rabbinical school at Jerusalem, or possibly Essenes. They have been construed as Essenes for at least a century past; so, for example, by Karl Friedrich Bahrdt, Karl Heinrich Venturini, August Friedrich Gfrörer, and others. For references to these, *cf.* Schweitzer, pp. 43, 47, 164 f., 161.

xvi: 7 has προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλ. It would seem, therefore, as if Mark meant the καθὼς εἶπεν to cover both clauses, and the προάξω ὑμᾶς of xiv: 28 to include a seeing of Jesus by the disciples.

But one cannot read xiv: 28 without feeling in it a certain disturbance of the context. In vs. 29 Peter repeats Jesus' words of vs. 27, "all shall be offended," as a foil to his protestation of his own unswerving loyalty. The promise of resurrection and return to Galilee, striking and splendid as it is, is passed over as if it had not been spoken. The context, without the promise, is a close unity, in which the promise is at best a foreign element. A declaration of the disciples' recreancy in the approaching trial is only weakened by the assurance that, after all, it will not really matter. However (ἀλλά), after I have risen, I will precede you into Galilee, and our interrupted fellowship will be resumed, as if your loyalty had not wavered! In order to make any connection here, the phrase "I will go before you" must be interpreted *ex eventu*, and that circumstance points to an *ex eventu* origin. It would seem as if all Jesus meant to express at this time was his foreboding that the disciples would, temporarily at least, lose their courage and their faith in him. The Zechariah-word need not be pressed to mean more than that. But the *ex eventu* consideration of the words inevitably saw in them a prophecy of what had happened, of a real scattering of the flock, a flight of the disciples to Galilee. And so, naturally enough, a word was added containing an allusion to their later experience in Galilee which made good their defection. The natural suggestion for the form of this added word was found in the angel's word in xvi: 7,

προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. But, as we shall see, this word was first added, in all probability, by the author of the Gospel of Matthew (xxvi: 32), and found its way into the Markan text by imitation of the latter passage rather than by direct suggestion of Mark xvi: 7.

The prophecy, "I will go before you into Galilee," is entirely different from any other of Jesus' promises of his resurrection in that it posits resurrection in a physical body, back into the earthly environment, and announces a journey of the risen body from Jerusalem back to Galilee, with an implied reunion with the disciples there. Without this reunion, as just pointed out, the words have no significance, though the reunion is seen to be implicit in the words only when the later events are known. Every other declaration by Jesus of his resurrection simply announces, "I shall rise again." There is no suggestion of the body's leaving the grave, of resuming relations to earth, *or of appearing to his disciples.* Jesus commonly speaks of his resurrection in connection with his parousia; the wording of his promises *never* implies rising out of the tomb back to the Jerusalem hillside, to Palestine, to the scenes of earth, but *always* rising out of the world of the dead into the heavenly world. Any idea of lingering for a time on earth by the way has been imported into these declarations entirely *ex eventu*, to fit the later gospel stories. To this important point we shall return again. It is sufficient here to point out that the prophecy of Mark xiv: 28 is of an entirely different sort from all the rest, that it has its only analogy in xvi: 7, where appears not only its analogy, but its verbal duplicate, save for tense and person

of the verb. In brief, xiv: 28 has every appearance of being, not only unhistorical as an utterance of Jesus, but an interpolation into the original Markan context.[1]

If this is true, we must seek for the words καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν in xvi: 7 a new point of reference. The angelic message, of which these words form a part, we have already recognised as the formulation of tradition, on the basis of the event, and we are therefore prepared to find that their supposed point of reference may be understood by the writer in a sense dictated by the event, and foreign to Jesus' intent. The author, knowing that the risen Jesus had appeared to his disciples, that the sum and substance of the preaching concerning his resurrection was the παράδοσις of those "appearances," *inevitably understood Jesus' prophecies that he would rise as meaning that he would appear.* So the readers from his day to ours have understood them. καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν, then, we shall take, as syntax bids, with αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε alone, and seek its point of reference, not in some earlier form of the προάγει clause, with which it has really nothing to do, but simply in Jesus' prophecy of the resurrection. The passages in Mark's mind are viii: 31, ix: 31, x: 34, and the like.

It cannot be shown that any later evangelist who used Mark as a source read xiv: 28. There is no trace of it in John, nor in Luke. The passage Luke xxii: 31 ff. lacks any such allusion, and xxiv: 6 f. explicitly explains Mark xvi: 7 as referring to Jesus' earlier

[1] This was argued by Wittichen, in *Jahrb. für Prot. Theol.*, 1879, p. 169 (note), and more fully, 1891, p. 512. *Cf.* also H. J. Holtzmann, *H. C., ad loc.*, and Völter, p. 6.

prophecies, such as Mark viii: 31 and the others just cited. This is not due simply to Luke's desire to suppress the connection of the resurrection-appearances with Galilee, as is frequently assumed, but is a perfectly correct understanding of Mark. The witness of Matthew is perhaps doubtful here. In xxviii: 7 Mark's καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν is rendered as ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν by Tischendorf and Westcott–Hort, in accordance with the MSS., but the latter editors suggest that εἶπον is a primitive error for εἶπεν. Other scholars, also, have conjectured that this very simple and natural error of one letter was made in our text of Matt., and that the original agreed with Mark.[1] If we retain the MSS. reading, it would appear that Matthew did not see anywhere in Mark a prophecy which agreed with the εἶπεν, and so changed it to εἶπον. That would look as if he properly interpreted the καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν as belonging to αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε alone, and either did not have xiv: 28 in his Mark, or did not regard it as having any connection here. If we read εἶπεν, there would still be no evidence that Matthew read Mark xiv: 28; he might simply be reproducing Mark's words in Mark's meaning, precisely as Luke did. It will at once be objected that Matt. xxvi: 32 reproduces Mark xiv: 28 word for word, that this, therefore, is the reference in mind in xxviii: 7 (reading εἶπεν), which clearly shows dependence on Mark. To this it may be answered that the reading εἶπεν is a wholly unattested conjecture, and that without it xxvi: 32 has no connection with the ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε of xxviii: 7, while even with this reading

[1] For these conjectures *cf.* Meyer Weiss, *ad loc.*, and Wittichen, *loc. cit.*

there is no necessary connection. The truth seems to be that Matthew failed to find in Mark any prophecy corresponding to "There shall ye see him, as he said," and so changed Mark's εἶπεν to εἶπον, as all our MSS. testify. With the καθὼς εἶπεν or ἰδοὺ εἶπον the προάγει clause has nothing whatever to do, in the mind of either evangelist, but on the basis of this clause, to relieve the tragedy of the disciples' prophesied defection, Matthew adds, in xxvi: 32, the words μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆνάι με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. From there the phrase was interpolated into the parent of our MSS. of Mark.

It may further be pointed out that in the Gospel of Peter there is no reference to Galilee in the angel's words, although Mark is being used, and the going of the disciples to Galilee and their sight of Jesus there are described in some detail. No stress can be laid on this, yet there is at least no evidence here that Mark xvi: 7 originally had reference to xiv: 28. If the author was unable to find in his Mark any point of reference for καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν, that would be one reason, at any rate, for omitting it and the words to which it was attached.

Finally, we may cite the so-called Fayoum fragment, discovered in 1885 among the papyri in the collection of the Archduke Rainer in Vienna, which apparently witnesses to an older text of Mark xiv: 26–30 than that in our MSS.[1] The text of the fragment as de-

[1] Out of the considerable literature of this gospel-fragment reference may be made to Harnack's treatment in *T. u. U.*, vol. v., part iv., 1889, pp. 483 ff.; Resch's in vol. x., part i., second *Heft*, pp. 28–34, and Zahn's in *Gesch. d. Kan.*, vol. ii., second half, pp. 780-790.

ciphered and restored by Professor Bickell, its discoverer, is as follows: . . . πρὸ τοῦ με μεταλλάγειν· ὡσαύτως· πάντες 'εν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ σκανδαλισθήσεσθε κατὰ τὸ γραφὲν· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται· ἐιπόντος τοῦ Πέτρου· καὶ εἰ πάντες οὐκ ἐγὼ· ἔτι αὐτῷ· ὁ ἀλεκτρύων δὶς κοκκύξει καὶ σὺ πρῶτον τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.[1] Some of Bickell's conjectured reconstructions are doubtful, other scholars have restored missing words somewhat differently, but these details are of no importance in our present connection. It is clear that the author of this text knew the text of Mark and almost certain that he knew it without the words of xiv: 28.[2] When this consideration is added to those already noted, we need not hesitate to regard Mark xiv: 28 as no part of the original text.

We have seen that the women's errand at the grave of Jesus lacks probability, that the discovery made at the tomb is even less credible, that the angelic message bears every appearance of being an *ex eventu* interpretation of the disciples' Galilean experiences. If we turn, finally, to Mark xvi: 8, the description of the women's conduct upon receiving the angel's bidding—or upon their experience at the grave, however it may be rationalised into a normal and commonplace occurrence,—this also is seen to be wholly incredible. If

[1] G. Bickell, "Ein Letztes Wort über das Papyrus-Evangelium," *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung des Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, 1892, pp. 78 ff. *Cf.* also E. Nestle, *Novi Testamenti Graeci Supplementum*, 1896, p. 67; Hermann Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, part i., 1889, p. 94; E. Hennecke, *Apok.*, pp. 9, 11, and *Handbuch*, p. 21; Erwin Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, 1901, pp. 19 f.

[2] See this urged by Alfred Resch in *T. u. U.*, vol. x., part i., second *Heft*, 1894, pp. 18, 326, 385.

the young man is an angel, or so regarded by the women, surely no fear of the authorities could prevent the fulfillment of a mission enjoined by a messenger direct from heaven. What penalties the women could incur from the Sanhedrin it is not easy to see, nor how the Sanhedrists could become aware of the secret whispering of a message into the ears of Peter and his companions, a message that bade these men depart at once from Judea, into Galilee and the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas. Or if we assume that the disciples have already left Jerusalem for Galilee, and that what is meant is that the women did not tell the general public, there are at once a host of objections.[1] Why should they tell the general public, when their message was a private one intended for the ears of the disciples? Did not the angel know that the disciples had left Jerusalem? Why then give the women a message which they could not deliver? Or if he did give such a message, was it not intended that the women should follow the disciples back to Galilee, and there make the communication? Is not this, after all, the natural thing to expect? These women are Galileans, only come to the capital to the feast; why should they not forthwith return to their homes, especially since the men of their party, sons and kinsmen, have already gone? The commentators seem in general, for no avowed reason, to think of the women as necessarily remaining in the city.[2] But if the women go to Galilee, their fear cannot still operate there to prevent all

[1] Keim, p. 554 (Eng. tr., p. 305), and others, take Mark to mean that the women told their experience to no one whom they chanced to meet on their way to their lodgings.

[2] The reason is, of course, the desire to harmonise this account

three of them from obeying the angelic command. They are safe from possible attack by the Jerusalem authorities, an attack already seen to be imaginary, even in Jerusalem.

But it may be argued that the ἐφοβοῦντο refers not to fear of the authorities, but, as commonly understood, to the τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις which fell upon them at seeing the angel and hearing his communication. Now it is of course impossible for any one in the twentieth century to discuss what conduct is proper or even psychologically conceivable when one is addressed by an angel. Any argument is here out of place; psychology, logic, all the laws of human thought and action withdraw from the stage when an angel makes his entrance. Yet one cannot help feeling that this supposition makes the women's conduct still more incomprehensible. Jesus had repeatedly assured his disciples that he would rise from the dead; these women, closely connected with the disciples as with himself, could hardly be ignorant of these declarations. Why, then, should they have been so frightened to hear that he had done just what he had said he would do, at precisely the time he had indicated—for the story assumes that resurrection means issuance from the tomb? With all their awe before the heavenly visitant, there can scarcely have been such amazement and terror at his communication, especially in such degree as to cause disobedience to his express command. The message would have been the most joyful possible; it is difficult to imagine the women keeping it to themselves under any conceivable

with the later ones, notably that of Luke. But Mark, taken by itself, is here, as elsewhere, irreconcilable with Luke.

pressure, how much less in the face of a direct bidding given by an angel from heaven. But again, all possibilities of argument are nullified when an angel becomes one of the premises.

If we take, then, such a suggestion as that of Professor Lake, that the young man was only a normal young man, and his words only a commonplace friendly direction, the confusion becomes worse confounded. Why the τρόμος and ἔκστασις? Why the terror? To be sure, the women later came to believe that they had seen an angel, but this was only after the "appearances" in Galilee, and the report of them by the disciples. What kept the women silent during the days or weeks, or whatever the interval may have been, between the Easter morning and that time? If they did not at once take the young man for an angel, they must have taken him for an ordinary young man. But if so, there is not the faintest excuse for their amazement, their terror, their flight, or for the statement that they told nothing to any man. For on a hypothesis like Lake's, what would they have to tell? What would be the tidings they withheld? It is surely meaningless to say that they told no one that they had seen a young man, who had perceived what they wished to do, and had spoken a word to them about it. Finally, "the detection of their errand" is far too feeble a cause for the amazement and terror without which the story has no point.

Thus again it is clear that the episode is a unity, that its elements had, when it was first related, the significance, and the relation to each other, which they now bear. It is not a historical narrative into which a legendary supernatural element has been introduced;

it is *in toto* a non-historical narrative, with every part of which the supernatural is equally connected, and every part of which owes its origin to a pious imagining, on the basis of the "appearances" in Galilee.[1] In plain words, there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the women went to anoint the body, that the grave was found empty, or ever was empty. Every consideration, on the contrary, points in precisely the opposite direction.[2]

[1] So P. W. Schmidt, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, part ii., 1904, pp. 406 f.

[2] So Schmiedel, col. 4066. The empty grave is regarded as unhistorical by Arnold Meyer, Knopf, A. Neumann, Weinel, P. W. Schmidt, Pfleiderer, Brückner, Brandt, Harnack, Weizsäcker, Volkmar, Keim, Strauss, and many others.

CHAPTER VII

THE EMPTY GRAVE

A CAREFUL examination of Mark's narrative has made it impossible for us to affirm, with a distinguished scholar, as a "material fact beyond discussion or controversy . . . that on the second day after the crucifixion, very early in the morning, the tomb where the body of the crucified one had been laid was found empty."[1] The evidence for that is precisely the same as for the angel, without whom it is never mentioned, apart from whom it has no existence. The two are parts of a single creation of faith. Not only is this the result of a study of Mark xvi., there are general considerations which point inevitably to the same conclusion. We have only to ask ourselves what would be the normal consequences of such a discovery. Eliminating the angel and his message, and assuming with Reville and many others that the tomb was found (by the women) on Sunday morning to be empty (for some simple natural reason), what would happen?

In the first place, we may well doubt whether the women would, on this basis, have inferred, as explanation of the emptiness of the tomb, that the Master had

[1] Albert Reville, in the *New World*, September, 1894, p. 512. Similarly Völter, pp. 3 and 31.

come to life and departed. There are so many natural ways in which a body might be removed from such a tomb that it is doing violence to all probability to suppose that the ecstatic thought would at once come: He is risen. It would be scarcely more natural for these Galilean women nineteen centuries ago than for American women to-day, who might find a loved one's grave open and tenantless. What would actually happen under such circumstances is well pictured in John's account of the visit of Mary of Magdala to the tomb (xx: 1 f., 14 f.). Seeing the tomb open, her immediate and natural thought is: They have taken away the Master out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him. And appealing to the supposed gardener, she begs: Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Indeed, the whole gospel account is far more consistent here than many of the critics, who fail to think the scene through. Nowhere do the women infer from the empty tomb that the Master has risen; in every case they learn this only from the lips of the angel, or from those of the risen Jesus himself. Here again the angel is seen as an indispensable element of the story. In truth, only a message from heaven could possibly have made the empty tomb mean the resurrection of the Lord.

It has, therefore, sometimes been assumed that during the first few weeks after the women's experience they had no suspicion of the resurrection, or any other thought than that Jesus' body had been surreptitiously removed and elsewhere concealed by unfriendly hands; only on learning that the disciples have seen the Master in Galilee do they interpret the facts otherwise.

Opposed to this is the fact, already ascertained, that the disciples did not report a meeting with the buried body in Galilee, as well as the difficulty of accounting for the removal of the body. Mark's story has no meaning save as it is attested to the women *on the third day* that their Master was risen from the dead.

But even granting that not until several weeks have elapsed does the discovery of the empty tomb become the great, indeed the only, external evidence of the resurrection, even so, events must have been other than as described. Indeed, it makes little difference whether on the third day, or on the forty-third, it became clear to the women that the disappearance of Jesus' body from its tomb was his resurrection; in either case the result would have been the same. That empty tomb would at once have become the centre of attention; it would have been given even exaggerated importance as an external proof, patent to all eyes, of the truth of the Christians' claim, for being the only such piece of external evidence, it would have to bear the entire weight of testimony. It is idle to say that the women could not identify, after a few weeks, the sacred spot where they had seen their Master laid, whither they had gone at early dawn with their spices, where they had been so startled and distressed at what had seemed to them profanation. They would find the grave at once, and would triumphantly point to it as the irrefutable confirmation of their claim. The unbelieving Jews would have used every effort to crush the heresy by showing how the body had actually been removed by human means; this ought not to have been difficult, and then the Christian faith would have been destroyed ere scarce it was born, since for the

hypothesis now being criticised the disciples' conception of resurrection involved the empty grave as a necessary element.

As a matter of fact, instead of being the very centre of debate, the empty grave does not appear as the subject of controversy at all, except in the late story of the guard, peculiar to Matthew. In all Paul's discussion of the resurrection, there is no faintest hint that it could be questioned except on general grounds of *Weltanschauung;* no empty grave is defended or alluded to. In the book of Acts we have many pictures of the controversy between the primitive Christian community in Jerusalem and their Jewish brethren, but the emergence of Jesus' body from its tomb is never a point at issue.[1] The appeal to it could hardly be avoided in ii: 32, iii: 15, iv: 33; in iv: 2 the only expedient, when the Sanhedrists are sore troubled because the disciples "proclaimed in Jesus the resurrec-

[1] Korff, pp. 42–57, 104 f., has the extraordinary view, which quite inverts all the existing evidence, that the empty grave, instead of being a strong argument for the Christians in their controversy with the Jews, was on the contrary used by the latter against the Christians. "You found the grave empty, and on that flimsy basis supposed your Master risen!" was the charge. This proved very embarrassing for the Christians, who were driven in desperation to suppress or deny the empty grave. For this reason Paul, who knows it well, never mentions it, and Mark asserts that the disciples were in Galilee and saw the risen Lord long before they knew of the empty grave. The truth (unknown, however to Mark), was that the women told the disciples of the empty grave before they left Jerusalem, and the first appearances came in that city. Despite Mark's long and intimate association with Peter, it never occurred to him, thinks Korff (p. 57), to ask the apostle concerning the time, place, and circumstances of the "appearances."

tion from the dead," is to throw them into jail. This is an entirely impossible situation, if the claim made by the disciples is that a certain tomb, lying close at hand for any one to see, no longer contains a dead body committed to it, because the dead man has risen.

If we are surprised at the lack of controversy over the empty tomb, and of interest in it on the part of unbelieving Jews, it is no less surprising to see how little notice it attracts among the Christians themselves. Besides the three women who made the discovery, only two of the followers of Jesus are reported to have even looked at the grave which has for centuries been the chief shrine of Christendom; for the rest it had apparently no interest or importance. Not even to see whether or no the women had told the truth would these men go near. Can that be made plausible? As a matter of fact, the vacant tomb, triumphant witness to their preaching and monument to their Master's divine power, would have been for these earliest Christians a sacred place of pilgrimage and of adoring reverence.[1] It could not have failed to appear, as a central element, in all their preaching of the resurrection, in all their controversy with the orthodox Jews. Mark clearly feels this; first putting the empty tomb into a written account, he feels called upon to explain why it was not a well-known and prominent fact in the earliest proclamation, as he knows it was not. His explanation is that only three women knew of the empty tomb, and that fear prevented them from telling anyone else. But Mark's explanation, however well meant, is from every point of view inadequate. Others besides the women would have had an interest

[1] *Cf.* Baldensperger, pp. 35 f.

in the tomb; what, for example, of the multitude of pilgrims from Galilee, who had made Jesus' entry into the city so triumphant, and whose enthusiasm for their prophet led the Sandhedrists to the swift and secret execution of their plan? "The complete absence of the impression which the empty grave must have made, the fact that, according to the oldest report, even the women who saw it said nothing about it, makes it improbable that the grave of Jesus was really empty."[1]

This general consideration, to be sure, has been used to support the actuality of the bodily resurrection. For example, Professor Marcus Dods writes:[2] "If the belief in the Resurrection was a delusion, why was it not exposed at the time? Hundreds of persons must have visited the sepulchre during the succeeding weeks. The apostles affirmed the Resurrection when they were brought before the Sanhedrim. Why did not the authorities at once explode this nascent sect and dangerous heresy, by exposing the delusion on which it was based? Nothing was easier, if the body of Jesus still lay in the tomb." The answer is, of course, obvious. This criticism takes for granted the very point at issue. If the resurrection proclaimed by the disciples was not the issuance of Jesus' body from the grave, then the criticism is meaningless.[3] The production of Jesus' body by the Sanhedrists, as a matter of fact, would as little prove to the earliest disciples

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 115 f.

[2] In *The Supernatural in Christianity*, 1894, p. 100. The same argument for the empty grave is brought by Clemen, p. 199, and by Schwartzkopff, pp. 115 f.

[3] *Cf.* Canon Henson, in *Hibbert Journal*, vol. ii., p. 489.

or Paul that the Master had not risen ἐκ νεκρῶν, as the production of Bishop Westcott's body, some weeks after his death, would prove to the common people of his diocese that he had not "gone to heaven."

The belief that the grave was found empty, as held by those critics who do not believe in the angel and the bodily resurrection, labours under another great difficulty. There is as yet no satisfactory conjecture as to how or why the body was removed. If we accept this view, we can only say: human hands took the body from the grave between the hours of six on Friday evening and three or four on Sunday morning. But who did it, with what motive, or what disposition was then made of the body, we are absolutely ignorant, and no conjectures will help. Some of the suggested theories we may note.

There is first of all a hypothesis which does away at once with any resurrection from the dead, and at the same time with any removal of the body, by friends or by foes. This is the "Scheintod" hypothesis, or theory of apparent death, according to which Jesus was not really dead at all, but taken from the cross in a state of syncope; in the tomb he revived and, with or without assistance, removed the stone and so came forth. The various "appearances," therefore, were simply the meetings of the still living Jesus with various friends. After sundry such meetings, Jesus is supposed to have withdrawn into seclusion, and at some time and place unknown, to have died a natural death.

This hypothesis, with variations in detail, has been argued by a considerable number of scholars, notably by Professor Paulus of Heidelberg; among many others who regard it as probable may be named Herder,

Schleiermacher, Gfrörer, Bunsen, and Hase.[1] The construction of events may be granted as within the limits of possibility; more cannot be said for it. That after all Jesus had suffered, he should have died after six hours on the cross is nothing strange, although victims commonly lived much longer, and Pilate naturally enough expresses a mild surprise over this speedy end. That he was only in a stupor, a stupor from which the process of taking him from the cross, (with the pulling out of the nails), and the preparation of his body for burial did not rouse him, a stupor so profound that those who performed these offices[2] de-

[1] H. E. G. Paulus, *Leben Jesu*, 1828, vol. ii., pp. 277–305; A. F. Gfrörer, *Das Heiligtum und die Wahrheit*, 1838, pp. 107–111, 232–252. For the further references, with discussion of the whole point, *cf.* Keim, pp. 573–576 (Eng. tr., pp. 326–331); Steude, pp. 23–34; Arnold Meyer, pp. 116 f., with the notes in each.

The Scheintod hypothesis, like most of the other suggestions of modern critics, was offered in ancient times. Pseudo-Justin (Diodorus of Tarsus?) must reply to it in no. 78 of the *Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*. Harnack, *Diodor von Tarsus* (T. U. Neue Folge vi., *Heft* 4), 1901, p. 107. *Cf.* Bauer, p. 483.

A curious argumentation for the hypothesis was offered by Jakobus Andreas Brennecke: *Biblischer Beweis: dass Jesus nach seiner Auferstehung noch sieben und zwanzig Jahr leibhaftig auf Erden gelebt und zum Wohl der Menschheit in der Stille fortgewirkt habe.* No place. 1819.

Recent exponents of this view are George L. Cary, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1900, pp. 326–329; Pierre Calluaud, *Le Problème de la Résurrection du Christ*, 1909. In a review of Baldensperger's "Urchristliche Apologie" (*Review of Theol. and Phil.*, Dec. 1910), William Watson suggests that the piercing of Jesus' side (John xix: 34) was the fourth evangelist's reply to the *Scheintod* charge made already in his time.

[2] Joseph must have been assisted, probably by servants.

tected no sign of life, is harder to believe. That in a tomb, of which the entrance was stopped by a stone, and which therefore must have been comparatively airless, he revived, and regained sufficient strength to push away the stone (which three women despaired of moving) and walk out, is most difficult of all. Of course it has been suggested that a fortuitous earthquake (Mat. xxviii: 2) removed the stone, and the shock revived Jesus; much is made of the coolness of the tomb, of the invigorating effect of the spices (these only in John xix: 39 f.), and the like. The white-robed men usually conceived as angels are interpreted as Essene physicians, ready to assist reviving nature; Joseph has perhaps suspected that life is not extinct and has made every effort to restore the Master to consciousness and strength. But this latter suggestion means that Joseph and Jesus alike were guilty of conniving at fraud, in their allowing without protest the disciples to proclaim their Master risen ἐκ νεκρῶν, on the basis of their having seen him and spoken with him, in the body, since his supposed death and burial.

Whatever grounds of abstract possibility may be urged for the recovery of a man who apparently dies after six hours of crucifixion, whatever favourable conditions our unfettered imagination may bring to facilitate that recovery, the whole hypothesis goes to pieces so soon as we come to the "appearances" of this resuscitated Jesus. If these appearances were simply meetings between the still living Jesus and his disciples the whole course of events becomes incomprehensible. To say that Peter and the rest, to say nothing of Paul (whose "heavenly vision" is brought into the same category), met and talked with Jesus alive and well, and

on the basis of these interviews proclaimed him "risen from the dead," as the New Testament makes certain that they did, is practically to assert their insanity. If the gospels make anything clear, it is that the followers of Jesus were not expecting any resurrection of his body from the grave; every announcement of it is greeted with amazement and incredulity, to say nothing of the burial, or of the anointing planned by the women and performed by Joseph and Nicodemus. It is impossible, then, to assert that these men, meeting Jesus again, miles away in Galilee (or, indeed, in Jerusalem), should at once say: This is a dead man risen, instead of the natural, inevitable inference: He then did not die. Can one imagine Jesus talking even for five minutes with the disciples, and leaving them with the resurrection-message on their lips? Either he or they, or both, must surely be charged with conscious fraud. And this resuscitated Jesus, who is strong enough to travel back to Galilee, and yet appears only a half-dozen times, in secret and mysterious fashion, to certain of his followers, who lives in hiding, cared for by unknown friends, never seen by any outsider, who five years later makes a journey to Damascus and there comes upon Saul of Tarsus in such sudden, startling wise as to change the world's history, who lives and dies no one knows where or how or when—this Jesus is a monstrous figment of a rationalising imagination. What nonsense this theory makes of I. Corinthians xv, and of that saying we once thought so profound: it pleased God to reveal his Son in me! And all this simply in order to be able to accept as perfectly historical Mark xvi: 1–5 while rejecting as perfectly unhistorical verses 6 and 7. It is one of the signs of an

increased sanity of critical judgment that this hypothesis is in recent years but rarely appealed to by reputable scholars.[1]

Accepting the fact of Jesus' death on the cross, then, there are numerous suggestions which would account for the removal of his body from the grave by natural means. All alike labour under the disadvantage of being unable to assign an adequate motive for the deed, whoever its perpetrator. One cannot easily imagine any reason for the action on the part of a Roman or other Gentile, while the Jewish religious scruples against the defilement caused by a grave and a corpse would make such action by a Jew most improbable, even if a plausible motive could be conjectured. A Jew, even if he were contemplating grave-robbery, would probably not violate the Sabbath by his deed; if so, the time of the action would lie between six on Saturday evening and three or four on the following morning, when Jesus has been thirty-three to thirty-six hours dead, and thirty hours or more buried. Reading the various critics, we get the impression that any number of Jews in Jerusalem would be ready, for almost any reason, to rob a grave of its body. Surely no impression could be more erroneous. Such an act was regarded as no less heinous then than now, and had against it, in addition, the belief in ceremonial pollution from dead bodies and everything connected with them.

It seems, however, most commonly assumed that if

[1] *Cf.* the criticism of the hypothesis by Keim and by Arnold Meyer, *loc. cit.*, and by D. F. Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk*, part i., section 47, especially the last paragraph (12th ed., 1902, pp. 375–378).

human hands took Jesus' body from the grave, those hands were Jewish. The most valuable discussion from this point of view has been offered by the late Professor H. J. Holtzmann.[1] His conjecture is, in brief, that the burial on Friday was only a hasty and provisional one, to avoid the violation of the Sabbath sanctity, and that on Saturday night Joseph removed and reburied the body, probably at Arimathea, his home. The empty tomb, however, agrees Holtzmann, had nothing whatever to do with the disciples' belief that Jesus had risen. That faith rested entirely on the "appearances," and originally, as with Paul, did not mean a rising of the buried body at all. Holtzmann doubts whether Paul ever heard of the women's story of the empty tomb, but this story, told later, had much to do with materialising the original conception into that presented by the gospels.

In addition to general considerations against the empty grave, it must be replied to this specific conjecture that it leaves Joseph quite without adequate motive for his extraordinary action. If his only concern is for the holy day, not for the body itself, there is no reason why the hasty burial of Friday would not suffice. Holtzmann properly understands that the grave is not Joseph's own; why may not the body remain there, at least till some one else may care to use the tomb? Why Joseph should come secretly during Saturday

[1] In the *Theologische Rundschau*, March and April, 1906. The same suggestion in his *Hand Commentar* on the Synoptics, p. 105. Oskar Holtzmann, pp. 392 f., and Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, 17th ed., 1882, p. 447, take the same view. Holtzmann's *Rundschau* articles offer a complete compendium of the literature *pro* and *contra* the hypothesis.

night, with servants or a pack-mule, defile himself and his assistants by the contact with the corpse, and hastily carry it off over the hills twenty-five or thirty miles, a journey that would last well into the following day, it is not easy to see.[1] Nor can one easily imagine, if Joseph were at such pains to dispose of the body, why no Christian was ever permitted to know of it, and how the resurrection preaching was allowed to go on without any disclosure of the real fate of the body. For Holtzmann thinks that the Christians before all too long, perhaps even in Paul's time, had begun to understand and proclaim the resurrection in the physical sense. Furthermore, it is wholly arbitrary of Holtzmann to reject, as he does, all the statements of Mark's account save only that the women went to the tomb and found it empty. Even the purpose of anointing he (correctly) finds legendary. But the account is too much of a unity, as we have seen, to allow of such division into true and fictitious elements.[2] Nor does this critic account for the lack of knowledge of the empty tomb in the early Jerusalem days. In general, any attempt to make Joseph a Christian or a friend of Jesus (not shared by Holtzmann), and so to explain his disposition of the body, is made futile not

[1] Arimathea is probably (so Holtzmann himself, p. 105) the modern Bêt Rîma, twenty miles, air-line, north-west of Jerusalem, and of course much farther by the winding roads over the mountains. Some scholars identify it with Er-Râm (Ramah), five miles north of Jerusalem. (So Arnold Meyer, p. 118.) *Cf.* the Bible Dictionaries.

[2] *Cf.* a very thorough and just criticism of Holtzmann's article by Schmiedel, in the *Protestantische Monatshefte*, vol. xii., no. 1 (Jan. 29, 1908), pp. 12 ff. Korff, pp. 226–230, also offers a trenchant criticism.

only by the witness of Mark, but by the fact that what he had done was never known in Christian circles.

Another suggestion has been made by Albert Reville[1] to the effect that on the principle: *Is fecit cui profuit*, the Sanhedrists had most motive for removing and secreting the body. They were unwilling that their hated enemy should have the honour of decent sepulture, but, more important, they feared lest the grave, if the body remained there, should become a place of pilgrimage for Jesus' Galilean followers, and so a centre of disturbance. Very likely they appealed to Pilate for permission and assistance in carrying out their purpose, which the procurator was glad to give; the "group of armed men who had been seen going toward the tomb" may therefore have given rise to Matthew's story of the guard. Consciousness of the meanness of their act kept these Sanhedrists and their assistants from ever mentioning what they had done.

We may well doubt whether such veneration of an entombed body was at all to be feared among first-century Jews, or whether the Sanhedrists would have defiled themselves in the attempt to prevent it.[2] Still more unlikely is it that no one of the very considerable number of persons concerned ever betrayed the secret, excellent weapon as it might have been against the Christian preaching—for Reville supposes that the disciples and all "the earliest Christians believed firmly that Jesus left the tomb, where his corpse had been laid, with a living body." In general, it may pass almost as an axiom that if the disciples had preached

[1] In the *New World*, September, 1894, p. 514; *Jesus de Nazareth*, vol. ii., pp. 460–463. Similarly, Völter, pp. 30 f.

[2] *Cf.* Schmiedel, col. 4066 *c;* Arnold Meyer, p. 117.

the resurrection of Jesus' body from the grave, and if the grave were empty because Jewish hands had removed the body, the preaching would have been stopped by the disclosure of this latter fact. That no such disclosure was ever made is consistent with the view of the gospels, in which angel and earthquake are integral parts, or with the view that the grave was not empty, nor so preached; it is utterly inconsistent with Jewish responsibility for the body's disappearance.

A suggestion somewhat similar to Reville's dispenses with the Sanhedrists, and supposes Pilate to have sent Roman soldiers "to open the tomb and remove the body, for the very same object as that for which Lord Kitchener lately destroyed the Mahdi's remains in the Sudan—that they might not become a centre of veneration, and thus start a new cult, having as its object a man whom the law had executed as a malefactor." This expedition of the Roman soldiers is, as similarly in Reville, held to be the suggestion for Matthew's account of the guard at the tomb.[1]

A more ancient suggestion starts from the "garden" of John xix: 41. If certain Jews of the first century (before "John" was written and the garden heard of) mockingly suggested that Jesus' own disciples had stolen the body, others of the second century had another solution which at least has the merit of greater plausibility, even if no more true to the facts. Both are referred to by Tertullian, in the last chapter of his treatise on the Shows. In splendidly dramatic language he pictures the great spectacle of the end of the

[1] T. W. Rolleston, in the *Hibbert Journal*, vol. iv., p. 640. The whole article is keen, and worth reading.

world, and the punishments meted out to the enemies of Christianity. Most of all he exults in the retribution visited on the Jews, as they appear for judgment before Christ. He joys to think how he shall then cry out to them, "This is that carpenter's or hireling's son, that Sabbath-breaker, that Samaritan and devil-possessed! This is He whom you purchased from Judas! This is He whom you struck with reed and fist, whom you contemptuously spat upon, to whom you gave gall and vinegar to drink! This is He whom his disciples secretly stole away, that it might be said He had risen again, or the gardener abstracted, that his lettuces might come to no harm from the crowds of visitants!"[1]

The substance of these and other Jewish animadversions upon the gospel story we find in the mediæval *Sepher Toldoth Jeschu*. For example, in the Vienna MS. of that curious work we read, after the description of Jesus' crucifixion, "He remained hanging until evening, and the young men and the women threw cords, mud, arrows, and stones upon him. But at evening the Wise Men [*i.e.*, the Jewish religious leaders] sent to take him down, and they took him down that they might fulfil what stands (in the Scripture): 'Let his body not remain upon the tree,' so also did they, and buried him. Afterwards came the Apostates [*i.e.*, the disciples of Jesus], and the Apostates made a plot to steal the corpse of Jesus and conceal it in another place, that they might say he had ascended to heaven, and

[1] "De Spectaculis," ch. xxx. Trans. by S. Thelwall, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American Ed., vol. iii., 1885, p. 91. The Latin of the last sentence may be quoted (Ed. Oehler), "hortulanus detraxit, ne lactucæ suæ frequentia commeantium læderentur."

that they might on account of him smite the Jews fearfully. At that time there passed by a Jew, by name Judas the gardener, and he perceived the words of the Apostates, and their plot. What did this Jew? He went toward evening by night, made a grave in his garden, stole Jesus from his grave, and laid him in his garden. Afterwards the Apostates came to take him, opened his grave and found him not, for Judas the gardener had already taken him. The Apostates said, 'Surely he was the Son of God and Messiah, and his Father in Heaven has taken him into Heaven; now shall we demand his blood and take vengeance on Israel, that no single one of them be left.' "

Then follows the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection before Queen Helena, wife of Constantine, who succeeded Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon [*sic!*], whereupon she sends the Sanhedrists to investigate the tomb. They in confusion report it empty, and in wrath she gives them five days to find the body, swearing that if they fail she shall put to death every Jew in the world, because they have slain the Messiah. Then is great weeping and distress in Israel, and great exultation among the Christians. At last the fatal fifth day arrives. "On that day Rabbi Tanchuma went out of the city and fled to the gardens, weeping and crying without pause. And he lifted up his eyes and behold, Judas the gardener was eating and drinking in his garden, singing and dancing. Rabbi Tanchuma said to him, 'Foolish one, art thou no Jew, that thou thus rejoicest? Why shouldst thou make merry when all Israel sorrows?' Judas the gardener answered, 'Wherein consists the distress of Israel?' Then Rabbi Tanchuma told him all that had taken place.

Thereupon the gardener spoke and confessed everything, what he had heard from the Apostates, and what he had done with the corpse. 'Sorrow not,' said he, 'for he is in my power. Be glad.'" So all the Israelites come with trumpets and horns, buy the body from the gardener for thirty pieces of silver, and drag it in triumphant procession through the streets of the city, and before the queen.[1]

In this narrative we see a combination of many elements,—the garden of Joseph, Judas the traitor, and the field which he bought, the thirty pieces of silver, the discovery of the empty tomb, and other points of the canonical accounts, as well as certain apocryphal elements.[2] It is clear that toward the end of the first century and through the second, the Christians were claiming that Jesus' resurrection involved the disappearance of his body from the tomb. The Jewish opponents of that day, unable to disprove the fact, took the easier method of explaining it by a more probable hypothesis. At first, and more commonly, it was said that the disciples had themselves stolen the body, in order to make the claim of bodily resurrection. Others declared that the disciples would have done this had their intention not been frustrated by the forethought of a clever Jew. Others again, that the gar-

[1] English rendering of a German translation by Samuel Krauss, in his *Leben Jesu nach Jüdischen Quellen*, 1902, pp. 107 f. This work is the most recent and most complete edition of the Toldoth. Different recensions of the work have some differences of detail; *cf.* pp. 58 f., 126 f. The material of the Toldoth can be traced in Jewish circles from the latter part of the second century; we find it in written form at least as early as the thirteenth century, probably as early as the ninth (Krauss, pp. 2–7).

[2] *Cf.* Krauss, pp. 168–171.

dener would protect his vegetables from the crowd by removing the object which drew the crowd. Common to all these Jewish explanations is the assumption that the body was, or might become, in itself an object of veneration, a suggestion made use of also by Reville and others. This is in itself unlikely among Jews of that time,[1] and the idea has its origin in the exaggerated importance given to the body by the claim that *it* had risen. The Christians of the year 100 would have venerated the body of Jesus, could they have found it, and made it an object of pilgrimage, but not so the disciples of the year 30. The origin of these Jewish explanations of the empty tomb in the stress of disputation is sufficiently clear, and they need no critical refutation in our time, as they did in the days of "Matthew" and of Tertullian.[2]

In this connection may be mentioned an explanation suggested by Professor Paul Schwartzkopff. He writes, "It is barely possible that some one from the less immediate circle of the followers of Jesus may have done such a thing, in order, perchance, to obtain a sacred relic in the superstitiously revered body of the Master. . . . Worship of this kind was nothing unusual in those times."[3] But the latter statement is certainly too confident, and a group of people possessing and worshipping the body of Jesus, yet not

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 117, and *per contra*, Krauss, pp. 169 f.

[2] For further early Jewish criticism of the resurrection narratives *cf.* Justin, "Dialogue with Trypho," 108 (Eng. trans., in *A. N. F.*, American Ed., vol. i.), and Origen, "Against Celsus," ii: 55–63; v: 56, 58 (Eng. tr. by F. Crombie in *A. N. F.*, vol. iv.).

[3] From a valuable article in the *Monist*, vol. xi., pp. 1 ff. (Oct. 1900). Citation from p. 9. Similarly in his *Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, etc., pp. 117 f.

joining the Christian church, or betraying the possession of the sacred relic, or interfering with the preaching of the bodily resurrection (assumed by Schwartzkopff), is surely inconceivable in Judea in the first century.

In some ways more plausible, even if more abhorrent to our sense of reverence for the fathers of the faith, is the old theory of the Jews that the disciples themselves had secreted the body, to furnish a basis for their preaching of the resurrection. This suggestion was taken up by Hermann Samuel Reimarus and given a new point, to the effect that the disciples were unwilling to give up the easy, indolent life assured to them by their association with Jesus, and provided for its continuance by making way with his body and proclaiming him as the miraculously risen Son of God.[1] The actual results of the disciples' preaching on their worldly fortunes is more than sufficient refutation of this remarkable suggestion.[2]

We see, then, that not only is the whole course of events strongly against the probability of the empty tomb, but that no natural explanation of the removal of the body can really be made plausible. Unconvincing, further, is the argument of Rohrbach, von Dobschütz and others, that the dating of the resurrec-

[1] The passage of Reimarus was printed anonymously by Lessing as the last of five "Fragmente" in "Ein Mehreres aus den Papieren des Ungenannten, die Offenbarung betreffend," which formed the twentieth number (pp. 261–494) of the fourth issue (1777) of his *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur aus den Schätzen der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel.*

[2] For further discussion of theories as to the removal of the body, *cf.* Keim, pp. 570–576 (Eng. tr., pp. 323–331) and Arnold Meyer, pp. 116–120.

tion on the third day points to some decisive occurence on that day, which can only have been the discovery of the empty tomb. Even Paul's ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ is held to prove that he knew the empty tomb, and rested upon it as one proof of the resurrection itself, and *the* proof of its date.[1] Our discussion of the third day as an element in Paul's resurrection-statement has shown the incorrectness of this exegesis. That these critics should refuse to accept Paul's own definite reply (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς) to the question: How do you know Jesus rose on the third day? and substitute an answer (the discovery of the empty tomb) to which he never has the faintest allusion, with which he never betrays the slightest acquaintance, is surely one of the curiosities of criticism.

It may not be superfluous to point out again that the women's discovery on Sunday morning would not be the faintest proof that the body had left the tomb on the third day, that is, after sunset on Saturday. So far as that discovery is concerned, "the second day" is an equally possible date. There is absolutely no external fact that decides between these two dates. What, then, must decide between them? Surely inferences from prophecy, or Jesus' own words. Why then are such inferences declared invalid to date the resurrection on the third day as against the fifth, or seventh,

[1] Rohrbach, *Berichte*, pp. 77 f.; von Dobschütz, pp. 12–15; Lake, pp. 195 f.; Louis Eugène Menegoz: *Le Péché et la Rédemption d'après Saint Paul*, 1882, p. 261; J. Weiss, *Das Älteste Evangelium*, 1903, p. 344, and many others. Against this view *cf.* Schmiedel, cols. 4058–9. And J. Weiss may be quoted against himself: *Schriften des N. T.*, vol i., p. 41, "In Paulus' Denken hat [das leere Grab] keine Rolle gespielt."

or tenth, if they *must* be valid to fix the third day as against the second? Von Dobschütz argues that the belief in the resurrection itself came from Jesus' "appearances," not from the discovery of the empty tomb, but that the latter is absolutely demanded by the date assigned, which all Old Testament prophecy and all Jesus' predictions never could have suggested.[1] But, as we see, they must fix the day, after all, and the empty tomb has no indispensable part to play. The disciples believe that Jesus has risen, because they have seen him; they ask: When did he rise? The date must be one of the days—let us assume for the moment twenty-one; it cannot have been much longer and was probably not so long—between the day of Jesus' death and the "appearance" to Peter. It is surely absurd to say that without some external event the disciples would have been quite unable to say on which of those twenty-one days the Master arose, and might have surmised the eleventh or the seventeenth! The external event is as unnecessary here as in the origin of the belief that the world was created in seven days, that Jesus was a descendant of David, or that he was the son of a virgin. As a matter of fact, the disciples would never have raised the question of date at all, anxiously trying to decide among the days. The third day was given antecedently and accepted by

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 15. Lake's argument is even more attenuated. Almost alone among critics, he sees that the empty grave would not decide between the second day and the third (pp. 254 f.); therefore its part is simply to fix the *terminus ad quem*. Other considerations, Scriptural, mythological, and the prophecies of Jesus, decide for the third day as against the second. They could as easily decide for it as against any other possible date.

them, not arrived at by them as the result of any investigation or outward happening.

To argue that Paul's words καὶ ἐτάφη imply that in his view Jesus rose ἐκ τάφου is equally unsuccessful, as has already been shown.[1] More significant, at first sight, is Rohrbach's argument that the Jewish contention that the disciples stole the body is proof positive that the body had disappeared.[2] But this loses all weight so soon as it is remembered that this contention meets us only at the end of the century, in the Gospel of Matthew. Its origin is simply *the claim of the Christians* that the body of Jesus had risen. If we suppose that claim to have been generally made in the years from the sixties on, and its refutation by the Jewish suggestion of grave-robbery by the disciples to have followed comparatively soon, as is natural, we have a complete explanation of Matthew's statement: this saying was spread abroad among the Jews until this day. It has been spread abroad from thirty to forty years at the time "Matthew" is writing; very likely he may have been familiar with it in his childhood. To imagine that the inhabitants of Jerusalem, at the time of the Jewish war, had any possible means of proving whether or no the body of an executed Galilean peasant had disappeared from its grave thirty or forty years before, is of course nonsense. The easy thing, the only possible thing, was to grant the alleged

[1] So Völter, p. 27; von Dobschütz, p. 11; Orr, p. 39; F. Kattenbusch, *Das Apostolische Symbol*, vol. ii., 1900, pp. 646 f. Kattenbusch is well answered by H. Weinel, in *Z. N. T. W.*, 1901, pp. 40 f. *Cf. supra*, pp. 37 f. and 108 f.

[2] Rohrbach, *Berichte*, pp. 78–83. *Cf.* Holtzmann, *Theol. Rundschau*, April, 1906, p. 119.

fact, and deprive it of all significance by another explanation. But this *ex post facto* explanation is hardly in a position to guarantee the fact.[1]

As we have already seen, there is no particle of evidence that the empty tomb appeared in the preaching and the controversy until the years just preceding the time when we find it first written, in Mark's gospel. We find it there in very simple, undeveloped form, and with a consciousness of doubtful historicity. Mark plainly knows that the empty tomb is a recent element in the Christian proclamation, not a part of the preaching he had heard in Jerusalem in the early days, or from the apostles with whom he had travelled. He is not critical enough to question the statement; he simply accounts for its absence in the earlier preaching by his declaration that the women had dared to tell no one. But this explanation is in itself so improbable that it could not satisfy any thoughtful reader. It is self-contradictory; if no one was told, how did Mark come to know? Fear could not permanently seal the women's lips. Every later user of Mark's account altered this statement; the first sentence of the "shorter conclusion," found in some MSS., is an almost inevitable correction; "all that was bidden them they briefly declared to Peter and those with him."[2] So Matthew attempts to correct; "they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy and ran to bring his disciples word. And as they were going, behold some of

[1] For this criticism of Rohrbach, *cf.* Schmiedel, in *Prot. Monatshefte*, vol. xii., p. 21.

[2] For the "shorter conclusion" and its attestation, *cf.* Westcott–Hort, *N. T. in Greek*, 1882, appendix, "Notes on Select Readings," pp. 38, 44 f.

the guard," etc. We lose sight of the women "as they were going"; we are not told anything of a message delivered to the disciples, though we may infer it. "Matthew" inferred it, but it is plain that he had no tradition of any such message actually delivered to the disciples, or of any knowledge of the empty tomb on their part.[1] No such knowledge is indicated in his gospel. His correction of Mark, that is, is inconsistent and only partial.

Luke is more definite and thoroughgoing; much more remote, also, from the consciousness of the original situation. He supposes that the empty tomb was known to the disciples and a part of the earliest proclamation; his correction of Mark is very explicit, and twice repeated. Mark's double negative in declaring that the women did not tell is balanced by Luke's reiteration that they did tell. The correction is deliberate. "They returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven and to all the rest. Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James; and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles." We have here a larger company of women delivering the message, a larger number of followers of Jesus receiving it. Yet Luke also knows too well for denial that the disciples had believed in Jesus' resurrection because their Mas-

[1] Nothing can be clearer than that Mark thought of the disciples as going to Galilee without hearing of the empty tomb, and that this corresponds to the actual fact. Wellhausen (*ad* Mk. xvi: 8) well says, "The appearance of Jesus loses its point, if his resurrection was already known to the disciples in advance, and was only to be confirmed subsequently by the appearance." *Cf.* also Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, p. 289.

ter had appeared to them, that even if there were a message of the women about an empty tomb, it had produced no effect, no conviction, in the disciples' minds. So he adds, perforce, the psychologically and historically incredible statement concerning the disciples, "these words appeared in their sight as idle talk, and they disbelieved them." Only when the Master "appeared to Simon," then to the others, did they believe. Luke's correction of Mark, then, though thoroughgoing, is not made plausible, and does not wholly conceal the historic situation.

"John" has acted in somewhat similar fashion. Mary Magdalene, seeing the stone taken away from the tomb, runs and tells Peter and the beloved disciple that the body has been taken from the grave. It is to be observed that she has seen no angel and has no angelic message; she knows nothing of any resurrection. What she tells, she tells to two men only, and it is simply the troubled utterance of a woman who does not yet believe, of similar value to the women's perplexed question in Mark: Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb? She believes in the resurrection only when she sees the risen Lord, and when she delivers that announcement (xx: 18), two, at least, of the disciples have themselves already become believers.

This universal correction of Mark's denial of any utterance on the women's part shows that for all readers of Mark there was the imperative need to correct him. Not that there was anywhere the slightest tradition of any message given by the women to the disciples—it is clear that there was not—but because the earliest preaching of the resurrection was being

conceived as the preaching of a body come from the grave. In other words, all these correctors understood Mark to mean, as he does mean, that the women did not tell until years had gone by, until near the time of his writing, and that therefore the early church had been ignorant of the whole empty tomb episode. Their correction of Mark is a correction of that conception; it has no other motive. If they had understood him to mean, as some harmonists would distort him into meaning, that the women talked to no one on the way to their lodging, or that they kept silent only for a few hours, or even days, they would have had no reason to make these explicit and emphatic statements to the contrary. But the suggestion that the early church knew nothing of the empty tomb they cannot let stand; not that they have any information to the contrary, but that their theory of what the resurrection was makes it impossible. They are certain, and with perfect right, that if the grave was found empty, the early Church must have known it at once and made much of it. The correction has no interest whatever in the action of the women, but every interest in the understanding of the resurrection among the earliest Christians.

Mark, therefore, as his first readers perceived, witnesses to the fact that the church of the first three decades after Jesus' death, at any rate, knew nothing of the empty tomb. It was not the three women on the morning of the third day who discovered that empty tomb; it was the Christian church about the year sixty. In such circles and at such a time as to make any verification impossible, the story had its rise, the child of the resurrection-faith, falsely apprehended. As the original apostolic conception of what glorious change

had come upon Jesus the Messiah when he had laid down his life upon the cross underwent its inevitable materialisation, it created its legend around it. As the error which Paul had combated years before in Corinth became more and more common in the minds of the Christian population, and "the resurrection of the body" came to necessitate, in popular thought, a change wrought upon the entombed body of flesh, the idea of the empty grave inevitably suggested itself. And the idea could not exist merely as an idea, an inference that the grave must have been empty. Inevitably it began to shape its legend, and to tell how the grave was known to be empty, by whom it was seen, with what marvellous circumstances its discovery was attended, and the like. This process is seen at an early and comparatively sober stage in Mark; it develops into extreme reaches of the fantastic in the later "apocryphal" narratives. None the less is Mark xvi: 1–8, the earliest written allusion to the empty tomb, as truly legend as the grotesque picture of Pseudo-Peter.

After the legend is fixed as a part of the Christian preaching, begins the controversy over it; the Gospel of Matthew shows this controversy keen in the last quarter of the century. To that period belongs the empty grave, not to the years of the third, fourth, fifth decades.[1] The gospels meet the apologetic demands of their own times; out of them we can learn what were the *foci* of controversy as they were written.[2] If the

[1] *Cf.* Lake, p. 195.

[2] *Cf.* the excellent book of E. F. Scott, *The Apologetic of the New Testament*, 1907, and W. Baldensperger, *Urchristliche Apologie*, 1909, which deals specifically with the apologetic aspect of the resurrection narratives. Further, Wernle, p. 296.

empty grave had been prominent in the proclamation and controversy of Christianity's first decades, the disputing would have largely died away before "Matthew's" time, and the story of the guard would appear, if at all, in a less pointed recension. The vigor of the argument in Matthew is a sign of youth.

To attempt to account for the origin of the legend in specific detail would be fruitless, as in all similar cases. No one knows how legends arise and grow and get themselves at every point believed; yet all legends have some genesis. We are fortunate if we can discover certain of the suggestions from which they ultimately spring. The fact that Jesus' disciples had fled, leaving certain of their female companions the only sources of information as to what followed Jesus' arrest and condemnation by the Sanhedrists, made it natural to expect from them witness also to the empty tomb.[1] If they found the tomb empty, they must have gone thither for some purpose. The anointing was a natural suggestion for one without a clear conception of the circumstances, and the anointing at Bethany, by a woman whom John (xii: 3) names Mary, of whom Jesus said, "Let her alone; . . . she has anointed my body aforehand for the burying" (Mark xiv: 8), may have offered a suggestion.[2] What the women discovered on reaching the tomb was given by the theory itself; the stone must be removed, that the body might pass out and the women pass in. The angel is almost inevitable in such narratives—*cf.* the book of Acts!—and is necessary to give the announcement of the Lord's resurrection.

[1] *Cf.* Schmiedel, col. 4071, 25 *a*.

[2] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 113 f.

In some such way the details may have suggested themselves; any certainty on the point is unattainable, nor would it have great value. We would do better to desist from any speculations as to the precise origin of the details of the legend, being certain only that it is legend, and not history.[1]

About the year fifty-seven we found prevailing in Corinth the error which produced the legend of the empty tomb. How much earlier this error was held by individuals here and there we have no means of learning. The following years saw it spreading in ever more concrete and detailed form, until about the year seventy, so far as we can tell, it first gets written down, by John Mark, probably at Rome. It has been forty years since Jesus was buried in Jerusalem. Forty years of oral tradition, during which the gospel has been growing and spreading rapidly among the ignorant populations of the Mediterranean world, preached by missionaries who for the most part were not Palestinians and had not been in the country at the time of Jesus' death, men who knew only at second hand, or

[1] Arnold Meyer, pp. 124 f., makes certain tentative suggestions as to possible actual occurrences behind the legend, but attaches no value to them. "Who would dare to follow up such possibilities and set the products of his own fancy in place of the devout poetry of the primitive congregation? This had in truth no need of such historic basis; we see in the other gospels how it ceaselessly goes on working out of its own inner power, and this it will have done also in Mark, without our being of any assistance by our conjectures." Meyer's conjectures are, in truth, little plausible, and would better have been omitted. *Cf.* their criticism by Orr, pp. 132 f. More plausible is the suggestion of Baldensperger (pp. 37 f.) that the legend began in the utterance of a charismatic speaker in the Christian meeting.

third, or sixth, of these things. Forty years, during which the gospel has been uprooted from its native soil and transplanted into an alien world, of another speech, another culture, another habit of thought and view of the world, an utterly different religious antecedence. Forty years, during which the original disciples and all to whom the "appearances" had been vouchsafed have passed away, in which Palestine has been devastated by an unspeakably savage war, Jerusalem destroyed, sacred sites wiped out, and the small band of Palestinian Christians driven into an exile and obscurity from which it never emerged into any real connection with the Christian movement as a whole, degenerating ultimately into a fantastic superstition, negligible and neglected in the triumphal advance of the Church.

Of that group which fled to Pella there cannot have been more than a very few who were followers of Jesus in his lifetime, and knew at first hand of the tragic events in Jerusalem two-score years before. The evangelist Mark is not one of that group; as early as the year fifty we find him leaving Jerusalem as companion of the great apostles in their expedition into the Gentile world (Acts xii: 25, xiii: 5). We have no indication that he was in Palestine after the year fifty-two, when he starts for Cyprus (Acts xv: 39); our only other glimpse of him is in Rome (Col. iv: 10, Phm. 24). Out of his experiences in the Gentile–Christian world he is moved to construct his propaganda-pamphlet, mirroring not only the teaching of the apostles with whom he had companied, but also the thought and feeling and practice, the apologetic and attack, of the environment in which he is living.

The legend of the empty grave is part of that contemporary apologetic, and he reproduces it, still in comparatively simple, undeveloped form. He tells of no appearances of Jesus in Jerusalem, of no knowledge on the part of any one there, save the three women, that the body is no longer in the tomb. All is quiet in Jerusalem as yet. Even the disciples have departed, sadly enough, for their northern home. Only three women have a strange secret—but they tell it to no man.

BOOK THREE

THE WITNESS OF MATTHEW

CHAPTER VIII

JERUSALEM

THE conception of Jesus' physical resurrection, with its corollary, the empty grave legend, experiences a relatively swift and steady development. Mark's gospel gives it body and wings. As Christianity rapidly spreads among new populations the legend grows with it. A quarter of a century passes, and there appears another version of "the gospel," this time also from the pen of a Christian of Jewish antecedents, though not of that Ebionite Christianity which still persisted in its will to be a sort of Judaism and not a free religion for all men. This author is little original; he combines the account of Mark with the "Logia" or utterances of Jesus, compiled nearly half a century before by the disciple Matthew, adds elements known to the tradition of his own day, and edits the whole into a "gospel" which simply registers the form which the deposit of Christian tradition had reached in his time and environment. Where he enlarges upon the account of Mark (which lay before him as a source), or corrects it, we commonly have evi-

dence of the advanced stage of the tradition, or of Christian thought and practice, in his time.[1] It is seldom that he furnishes "previously unpublished" material from the older tradition; his changes are usually due to his own reflections on the text of Mark. In his account of the events which followed the death of Jesus, this observation, in the main, holds true. It is apparent that the copy of Mark which he used was mutilated, ending with the ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ of xvi: 8, but up to that point—save for the one episode of the watch at the tomb—he has plainly no other source than Mark and his own pious reflections.

To control "Matthew's" narrative completely, we must begin with his account of the burial (Matt. xxvii: 57 ff. = Mk. xv: 42 ff.).[2] Mark's account here is quite explicit. "And it having already become evening, since it was 'Preparation' (which is the day before Sabbath), Joseph coming—he that was from Arimathea, a respected councillor, who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God—having plucked up courage went in unto Pilate and begged for the body of Jesus. And Pilate wondered whether he was already

[1] *Cf.* an interesting article by B. H. Alford, "Variations between Matthew and Mark," in the *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1909.

[2] F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 297 f., following suggestions of Loisy (vol. i., p. 223, vol. ii., pp. 696 ff.), decides that the body was never buried, but thrown into the common pit reserved for the executed. *Cf.* C. W. Emmet, "M. Loisy's View of the Resurrection," in the *Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1909, pp. 588–599, where references are given. This claim is not criticism, but arbitrary assertion. The same view in Volkmar, p. 603. For earlier denials or questionings of the burial, by Strauss and others, and their refutation, *cf.* Keim, pp. 525–527 (Eng. tr., pp. 271–274).

dead, and summoning the centurion he inquired of him if he were already dead, and finding out from the centurion, he presented the corpse to Joseph. And having bought a fine cloth, taking him down he wrapped him in the cloth and put him in a tomb which was cut out of a rock, and rolled a stone up to the door of the tomb. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the (mother) of Joses were observing where he had been placed."

In the first place, Mark notes the time; it was ὀψία, *i. e.*, the last division of the Hebrew day, the hours from three to six in the afternoon.[1] That the scene took place before six o'clock, or sunset, is plainly stated in the announcement that it was still Παρασκευή, or Friday. The time of Jesus' death is fixed by verse 34 as the ninth hour, *i. e.*, three o'clock in the afternoon. From that time on it is ὀψία, and most of the available time must have been needed, with all allowance for haste, for Joseph's recorded activities. There is no lapse of time intended between the events of vss. 37–41 and the ὀψίας γενομένης of vs. 42. About half-past three, then, we may picture Joseph as hurrying off into the city to seek Pilate.

The councillor's motive is hinted at by Mark, though not explicitly stated. Mark had of course absolutely no way of knowing Joseph's motive; he was left to inference, as we are, but his inference is the inevitable one. Joseph begged Jesus' body for burial because (ἐπεί) it was already late on the day before Sabbath. That can only mean, of course, that the

[1] It is difficult to understand Wellhausen's self-contradictory comments (*ad* Mark xv: 42, 46) that the burial must have taken place long after Sabbath had begun, because *ὀψία* "is never earlier than sunset, mostly later" (*sic*). And yet it is still Friday!

dead body ought not to remain unburied on the holy day. The Jewish custom (Deut. xxi: 22 f.) is so familiar to Mark that he does not explain it further, though the fourth evangelist (John xix: 31, 42) is more explicit.[1] As a matter of fact, the following day was not only Sabbath, but the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, most sacred day of all the year; it must not, therefore, be defiled. Any common day is polluted by the unburied corpse, how much more should this day be kept pure! And since burial would be unlawful on the holy day, the body would have to hang on the cross throughout the succeeding twenty-four hours, which would be most offensive. The Jewish feeling of the time may be voiced by Josephus, commenting on the "pitch of impiety" which cast out two bodies unburied: "The Jews are so concerned for burial that they take down before sunset and bury those who have been condemned and crucified."[2]

The motive of Joseph, therefore, is his interest in the sanctity of the feast day; the following clauses emphasise the fact of his loyal and orthodox Judaism. A distinguished member of the Sanhedrin,[3] and one who himself (like Simeon and others in Luke ii: 25, 38) was looking for the Messianic Kingdom, he is marked as

[1] J. Weiss, in *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 208, unnecessarily supposes Mark's original text to have been altered to conform to the Johannine explanatory clauses.

[2] *Bel. Jud.*, iv., 5: 2, quoted by Lake, p. 173. For further instances of ancient scruples as to burial, especially among the Jews *cf.* Keim, pp. 507 f. (Eng. tr., pp. 250–252), with notes, especially the references to Josephus.

[3] This is denied by O. Holtzmann, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, 2d ed., 1906, p. 228, and F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1908, p. 56.

a devout and zealous Pharisee. Nothing points to his being a follower of Jesus; Mark's description shows interest and appreciation for the man whose piety had furnished the Master with a grave, but that piety clearly has as its object the ancestral religion rather than the person of the crucified prophet. Mark does not know so much about Joseph without knowing whether or no he were a Christian; and he could not know him to be a Christian and fail, in this passage, to say so in unambiguous terms. This devout man who is looking for the Kingdom of God has certainly not seen in the Galilean builder the Messiah who is the establisher of that kingdom; he may, indeed, have felt a friendly pity or sympathy, seeing in Jesus a fanatic rather than a criminal, but more than this cannot be said.[1] His pity did not blind him to the fact that a claim to Messiahship from a man like Jesus brought with it the extremest condemnation. Other considerations aside, "it is expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (John xi: 50). Luke's inference, "He had not consented to their counsel and deed" (xxiii: 51), is natural and well-meant, but probably not correct. The fact that the only mention of Joseph in the New Testament is here in the account of Jesus' burial, that he disappears from the scene forever when he has

[1] *Cf.* Meyer–Weiss *ad* Mk. xv: 43. "He now would show the last honours to him who had lived and suffered for the hope of Israel." Mention may be made of the suggestion by A. Kalthoff (*Das Christus-problem*, 2d ed., 1903, p. 81) that Joseph and Nicodemus are perhaps reminiscences of the Consul Flavius Clemens, or of Asturias, who, according to Euseb., *Ch. Hist.*, vii., 16, buried Christian martyrs. There is quite gratuitous skepticism concerning Joseph in Maurenbrecher, p. 254.

rolled the stone before the tomb, shows that he never had any relation to the Christian movement.[1] That Joseph acts as a Jew, not as a Christian, is the obvious thought of Acts xiii: 29, "when they had fulfilled all things that were written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb," and should no longer be questioned.[2]

To this pious Jew, therefore, Pilate, after assuring himself that Jesus is actually dead, grants the body, an act of favour, indeed (ἐδωρήσατο), but quite comprehensible on the part of one who had had so little disposition to order the execution (Mk. xv: 14 f.). The hour must by this time be growing toward five. Apparently on his way from Pilate's hall back to Golgotha Joseph buys a sheet—the shops are still open, it is before six—then hastily takes down the body. No

[1] A. Reville, *New World*, Sept., 1894, p. 515, note, explains Joseph's "surprising effacement" by the fact that he knew what had been done with the body and could not therefore share the resurrection faith, *i. e.*, be a Christian. Is it, then, true that the possession of such incidental information would keep a man outside the Christian religion?

[2] This Acts passage at once prevents our reading too much out of Luke xxiii: 50 f., as if "Luke" reckoned Joseph on the Christian side. Further, *cf.* Keim, p. 525 (Eng. tr., p. 272) with the references to Tertullian and Lactantius. It is worth noting that according to John xix: 31 "the Jews" had already taken steps to secure the burial of the corpses, in observance of their law, and that if Joseph had not interred Jesus they would have done so. And according to John xix: 42 the burial by Joseph and Nicodemus is "because of the Jew's Preparation." So in the Toldoth Jeschu it is the Jewish leaders who bury Jesus, that they might fulfil the Deuteronomic prescription. *Cf. supra*, p. 221. All indications agree that the original motive for the interment was not devotion to Jesus' person, but concern for the law. *Cf.* Lake, pp. 176 f.

details are given; the haste is apparent. "Having bought . . . and taken down . . . he wrapped . . . and laid." The whole episode of the burial, from the moment Joseph receives Pilate's permission to that when the body actually lies in its grave, uses but thirteen words (καὶ ἀγοράσας . . . τῷ μνήματι). There must have been an officer sent from Pilate to authorise Joseph's action, assistance in removing the body he must have had—but all these details are taken for granted. The tradition did not preserve them; all that the women could report was that the body had been buried, and by whom.

As to the tomb itself, Mark says only "a tomb which was hewn out of a cliff," without further word of description. If we had only Mark's account, no one would ever have read in these words anything save a chance tomb, chosen for its proximity (as John xix: 42 understands), into which the body was hastened. Such tombs, liable to appropriation by any one who desired, existed in number without the walls of most Palestinian cities; in them lepers and demoniacs, already unclean, not infrequently found dismal habitation. So, *e. g.*, the Gadarene demoniac came to meet Jesus out of the tombs, where he had his dwelling (Mark v: 2–5). These burial caves were not the personal property of the demoniac or of his family, nor did he need to secure the permission of any one in order to occupy them. Empty and deserted, they were used by any one who would. Similar tombs may be seen in great number to-day about Jerusalem and other Syrian towns, one of the features most frequently commented on by travellers in that land.[1]

[1] On Palestinian tombs *cf.* George Williams, *The Holy City*,

In such a chance grave, unnamed and unmarked, which has nothing to distinguish it from a hundred others, Joseph hastily thrusts the body of Jesus, and rolling a stone against the entrance, with all speed departs to make his preparations for the feast. So much and no more, Mark's narrative, read by itself, says. We shall later see if the parallels in Matthew and Luke make it necessary to reconceive the nature of the tomb and the burial. Finally, Mark adds the authority for the report; it was Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses who "were observing where he had been placed" (ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται). The use of the perfect τέθειται would seem to indicate that the women did not actually witness the burial, but arriving on the scene after it is done, see where the body had been laid.[1] If they were not present at the interment, the identification of the tomb, in case it were ever attempted,

---

2d ed., 1849, vol ii., pp. 140 ff.; Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 2d ed., 1860, vol. i., pp. 352 ff.; James Fergusson, article "Tombs" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary* (1863); W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 1885 (see index under "Tombs"); T. Nicoll, article "Burial," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1898); Reports of the Palestine Exploration Fund for 1889 and 1897; S. Klein, *Tod und Begräbniss in Palästina*, 1908, pp. 66–100; J. Boehmer, in *Die Christliche Welt*, vol. xxiv. (1910), No. 13; Merx, part ii., Second Half, 1905, pp. 510–516, where interesting and valuable pictures of such tombs are given, more pertinent than the realistic ones in Henry Latham's *The Risen Master*.

[1] So B. Weiss, in Meyer–Weiss, *ad loc.*, and *Die Vier Evangelien*, 2d ed., 1905, pp. 277 f. The Textus Receptus has *τίθεται*. The Syr. Sin. has "had seen" in place of *ἐθεώρουν*, which would support this interpretation. Codex D has *ἐθεάσαντο τὸν τόπον ὅπου*, and some of the versions have perfect or aorist verbs. *Cf.* Merx *ad loc.*

would be more difficult, and a certain support would be given to Professor Lake's suggestion. But be this as it may; no great importance attaches to it, for our purpose. In any case, the women must be at least the traditional sources of all the information the early church possessed concerning the burial of Jesus.

Turning now to Matthew's version, let us note the changes. The time is, as in Mark, ὀψία, but the noting of the day of the week is omitted. Yet Matthew (xxviii: 1) knew that the day was Friday, and in xxvii: 62 the curious phrase "on the morrow, which is the day after Παρασκευή," instead of "the Sabbath," shows conclusively that he had the reference to Παρασκευή before him in Mark.[1] Matthew's omission is due to the simple fact that he (quite correctly) understood Mark's phrase ἐπεὶ ἦν κ.τ.λ. to give the motive for Joseph's action, and he had another motive to suggest in its place. It thus becomes practically certain that the original account in Mark meant to attribute to Joseph concern only for the ancestral law, and no personal relation to Jesus. Matthew naturally, almost inevitably, feels that the good man who had the exalted honour of laying the Messiah in the grave from which he had so gloriously risen, must be counted on the Christian side. It was a friend, not an enemy, above all, not one of that group of councillors who had condemned Jesus as a blasphemer and forced the unwilling Pilate to his execution, who had provided him sepulture. Joseph is exalted in Christian tradition precisely at equal pace with Pilate, and in inverse

[1] This meets the needless doubt of Lake, pp. 51 f., whether the phrase be not an interpolation in Mark. Luke xxiii : 54 also vouches for its originality.

ratio to the growing enmity toward the Jews. Lines are more sharply drawn; Joseph must take sides, friend or enemy, Christian or Jew. Like Pilate he ultimately becomes a Christian saint. Through Luke and John the process of his exaltation may be traced, and so on with scarcely a break to the legends which connect him with the Holy Grail and Glastonbury.

So we comprehend Matthew's rendering of Mark's "who also himself was looking for the Kingdom of God" as "who also himself was discipled to Jesus." He has no new source of information; he simply registers the automatic development of the tradition. So the εὐσχήμων βουλευτής he turns into ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος. He feels certain that Joseph cannot have been one of that group of chief priests and elders against which his gospel is more bitter than either of the others, that group which takes measures to guard the grave (how could it be the private property of one of their own number?) in xxvii: 62, and fabricates the most abominable of all slanders against Jesus' followers in xxviii: 12. As for πλούσιος, it was in the vulgar speech a synonym of εὐσχήμων.[1] Whether Isaiah liii: 9 hovered in Matthew's mind here is very doubtful; "the rich" are for the prophet very different folk from the evangelist's conception of Joseph, and "buried by a rich man" is hardly equivalent to "buried with the rich."[2]

Further, Matthew omits Mark's account of Pilate's query as to the speedy death of Jesus, and his verification of the fact. Since Luke has precisely the same omission, it has been suggested that xv : 44 f. is an

[1] H. B. Swete *ad* Mark xv: 43; Lake, pp. 50 f.

[2] *Cf.* Keim, p. 527 (Eng. tr., p. 274).

interpolation into the original text of Mark.[1] But no possible motive can be alleged for such an interpolation, while the incident in itself is not so important as necessarily to be reproduced. It is perhaps possible that Matthew supposes the earthquake, the opening of the tombs, the appearance of the revived corpses of the saints (xxvii: 51 f.) sufficient to apprise Pilate that his victim has actually passed away. What else could be the meaning of these portents, which Pilate could hardly have failed to observe? At any rate, there is no indication of a source of information other than Mark.

The tendency of Matthew, already noted, to exalt Joseph's personal devotion to Jesus, is seen in two slight but most significant changes in the account of the disposition of the body. The sheet (σίνδων) is clean, as a tribute of honour, and the place of burial is "*his new tomb* which he hewed in the cliff." That the tomb is new is only an expression of the common feeling that for the use of an exalted guest only that which has never before been used is suitable. Precisely so the colt "whereon no man ever yet sat" in Mark xi: 2. That the tomb is Joseph's own, which he had cut in the rock, is Matthew's natural inference; shall Messiah be laid, like a pauper, in any common, forsaken grave, and not rather in the most honourable tomb which the devotion of a rich disciple can offer? Matthew had no authority for this change but his own inference; it is an inference clearly intelligible and almost inevitable. But it is a mistaken inference; it was not at all what Mark meant, or what the primitive

[1] *Cf.* Lake, pp. 52 f.

tradition, which Mark is reproducing, understood. Joseph is no resident of Jerusalem, and in the absence of Matt. xxvii: 60 no one would ever have supposed him to be. Neither Mark, Luke, nor John affirms that the grave belonged to Joseph. Ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας means that he is at home in that city and only temporarily in Jerusalem, probably for the feast. Just so in Matt. xxi : 11 Jesus is called ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Joseph's "family tomb," of which commentators tell us so much,[1] would be at Arimathea, not at the capital. If our previous conclusion is correct, that Joseph was in no sense a follower of Jesus, then obviously he would not give up his own new grave. The two things are part of one conception in Matthew, and that conception an erroneous one. The original presentation of Mark is alone true to history; in a chance grave, chosen as conveniently near at hand, the pious councillor lays the body of Jesus and goes his way.[2] The women learned what had been done and observed where the tomb lay. But it had no marks of distinction, and identification after weeks or months would be a practical impossibility.

In the account of the burial, therefore, Matthew is dependent simply on Mark and his own reflections. We now come to his narrative of the succeeding events

[1] *E. g.*, Wellhausen, *ad* Mk. xv: 46, says, "That one not of kin, and one, moreover, who had been executed, is received into a family tomb, is very uncommon and magnanimous."

[2] So Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, *ad* Mk. xv: 46; Arnold Meyer, pp. 123 f. For the view that Mark, like Matthew, conceives Joseph as a disciple and the tomb his own *cf.* Korff, p. 158; Wellhausen *ad loc.;* J. Weiss, *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 208. Orr, p. 98, has a vigorous polemic against the view outlined above.

and its comparison with that of Mark. ὀψὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων: what are we to understand by these words? Literally taken, they can mean only one thing, and were it not for the apparent contradiction with Mark, they would never have been supposed to mean anything but "late on the Sabbath, as it drew on toward the first day of the week." The time indicated, that is, is just before sunset on Saturday afternoon. There is a possibility, indeed, that the words might literally refer to Saturday evening after sunset, the early hours of Sunday, ὀψέ being taken as roughly equivalent to "just after the close of," and τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ to "as it was beginning to be" the first day, etc.[1] But they cannot literally refer to the hour just before dawn on Sunday morning. It is all well enough to say that "there is no evidence for ἐπιφωσκεῖν in Greek in any sense except a reference to sunrise,"[2] yet Luke (xxiii: 54), who knew Greek well, uses it for a time which is plainly six o'clock in the evening, and the Gospel of Peter twice uses it in the general sense of "approach." Herod, on Friday morning *before* the crucifixion, says σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει, and the night after Sabbath is described as τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ ἐπέφωσκεν ἡ κυριακή.[3] Moreover, Professor Merx has shown that though the Greek word could not of itself, indeed, properly refer to the technical beginning of the Jewish day, at 6 P.M., yet it was forced into use as

[1] *Cf.* J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, vol. i. (Prolegomena), 2d ed., 1906, pp. 72 f., with *note*.

[2] Lake, p. 58.

[3] Swete's edition of *Gosp. Pet.*, 1893, pp. 3 and 16 of the text. Similarly διαφαύει (=διαφώσκει), in *Acta Pil.*, A, xii., 1, is used of Friday evening after the burial; *σάββατον διαφαύει.*

the necessary substitute for the proper Hebrew term, no other Greek word being available.[1] Taking the words by themselves, then, it would seem that, in Matthew's view, the women started toward the sepulchre just before, or about, six o'clock on the Sabbath, or Saturday, evening.[2]

But, on the other hand, we must not make Matthew contradict his own statements, and it is sufficiently clear that he is entirely at one with Mark in dating the resurrection on the third day, or Sunday. If the literal rendering of Matthew's note of time would place the event *before* Sunday, we must unhesitatingly conclude that however obscure and misleading his phrase may

[1] Merx, part ii., 2d half, pp. 506–508. *Cf.* part ii., 1st half, p. 437.

[2] So argued by R. W. Macan, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1877, p. 39; Keim, pp. 552 f. (Eng. tr., pp. 303 f.); Brandt, pp. 433 f.; Merx, *loc. cit.;* Allen *ad* Matt. xxviii: 1; Schmiedel, cols. 4041–2; Loisy, vol. ii., p. 717; Moulton, *loc. cit.;* Schmidt, p. 321, note 2; and others. The view that Matthew means Sunday morning is upheld by Zahn, Wellhausen, and B. Weiss *ad loc.;* Beyschlag, p. 435; F. Blass, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, Eng. tr., 1898, p. 97; Lake, pp. 56 f.; Orr, p. 124; Arnold Meyer, p. 30; Bauer, pp. 255 f., and most. It is noteworthy that the Syriac Didaskalia renders Matthew's phrase as follows: "Abends am Sabbat, als der erste in der Woche (Sonntag) anbrach," and the point of time is in the next sentence given as "drei Stunden in der Nacht nach dem Sabbat." A few lines further, "In der Nacht also, da der Sonntag anbrach, erschien er der Maria von Magdala und der Maria der Tochter des Jacobus, und im Morgengrauen des Sonntags trat er bei Levi ein und dann erschien er auch uns." H. Achelis and J. Flemming, "Die Syrische Didaskalia" (*T. U.* Neue Folge, vol. x., *Heft* 2), 1904, pp. 106 f. The clear meaning is that the women came to the grave Saturday evening, and that the resurrection occurred, after their arrival, at 9 P.M. The latter statement is repeated a little later (p. 112).

be, he means to express by it Sunday morning. But such contradiction is not at all present. The *day* of Jesus' resurrection was fixed from the first; the question as to the *hour* does not seem to have risen at the time of Mark's writing. Sometime in the ten or twelve hours between 6 P.M. on Saturday and sunrise on Sunday the great event occurred, unseen of mortal eye, is as far as Mark's picture goes. Matthew reflects more closely as to the time. Is it not natural to minimise the time during which Messiah is held in the power of death? He must wait until the third day, according to the prophecy, but with the first hour of that day there is no longer any reason for his tarrying in the grave. When one thinks of it, why should he linger there six or eight hours longer after the resurrection day had begun, and assert his power only at midnight or later? What more natural and fitting than that as the first hour of the new day struck, the earth should tremble and the tomb burst open at the touch of an angelic hand? Matthew's conception is psychologically and dramatically far more true than that of Mark, which passes over the actual event in silence, without indicating even its hour, and lays all its stress on the later discovery that it had taken place. There is no significance of any kind in the sunrise hour of Sunday; there is every significance in the sunset hour of the previous evening, which ushers in the glorious day. Matthew, then, gives another note of time than that in Mark because he is describing an earlier episode than that given by Mark. Matthew, it should be noted, is the only evangelist who at all indicates the time of the resurrection itself. Both Mark and Luke, as well as John, give only the time and the circum-

stances of the discovery that Jesus had risen, with no suggestion as to how much earlier the rising had taken place. Matthew does well, from every point of view, to synchronise the women's errand, the discovery of the empty tomb, and the angelic explanation with the hour of the great event itself. But there is nothing in any account to indicate that Matthew's hour, the earliest moments of the third day, is not the thought of all the evangelists, and of the entire primitive church, so far as the exact time of the resurrection was reflected on at all.[1] The statement of Matthew, however, with its alteration of Mark, is again due, not to any new information, but to his own reflections.

If the women start from the city just before the end (ὀψὲ) of the Sabbath, so that they would not cover a "Sabbath day's journey" before the new day had come, they will arrive at the sepulchre just in the earliest moments of the first day of the week, just in time to experience the earthquake and behold the angelic presence who rolls away the stone. Is not

[1] *Cf.* the late tradition that Jesus rose three hours after the new day came in (*i. e.*, at 9 P.M. not at 3 A.M. as Schmiedel will), in the *Didaskalia*, the *Anaphora Pilati*, and the old Latin codex *k*. These are commented on by Schmiedel, col. 4049, and Resch, *T. u. U.*, vol. x., part iii., pp. 758 f. For alleged traces of a tradition that Jesus rose on the evening of the Friday on which he died, *cf.* E. Preuschen, in Herzog-Hauck's *Realencyclopädie*, 3d ed., vol. xiv., 1904, pp. 727 f. The existence of such a tradition is very doubtful, but any basis it may have speaks at least for resurrection as soon as possible after death, and in the evening. Against it *cf.* Bauer, p. 256. *Acta Pilati*, A, xiii., 2 and xv., 5, gives midnight as the hour of resurrection. Wherever the hour of the resurrection is reflected on at all, it is placed early in the third day, never after midnight.

this very clearly what Matthew means? The one point in which it seems to be in contradiction to the further account is the statement (xxviii: 13) that the Sanhedrists plotted with the guards to say: his disciples came *by night* and stole him away while we slept.[1] But this is no necessary contradiction. Some of the guards go into the city (xxviii: 11) at the same time with the women, *i. e.*, after the events of vss. 2–10. It is already between six and seven. By the time they reach the city, find the chief priests, and tell their tale, it is growing late. Then the Sanhedrin is called together, the matter discussed, the plot worked out, so that vs. 13 brings us surely well into the night. Their tale the soldiers would not spread abroad till morning; who is to know, save themselves and the Sanhedrists, that the real removal of the body was some hours earlier than they claimed? The word of the women is precisely the thing they are contradicting *in toto*. Since their story as a whole is a cunningly devised falsehood, there is no reason for regarding this one item concerning the time of the falsely alleged grave-robbery as based on any fact. It is only a part of their excuse; that it was night accounts for their being asleep, and for the darkness which assisted the disciples' nefarious purpose. In other words, Matthew himself considers the νυκτός a part of the guards' falsehood, and there is no contradiction between verses 1 and 13, even when read literally. But in truth, the whole episode of the guards is a tissue of

[1] Urged by B. Weiss, Meyer–Weiss *ad loc.*, note. But Keim, p. 553, note (Eng. tr., p. 303) and Schmiedel, col. 4042, adduce the *νυκτός* of xxviii: 13 as *supporting* the reference of xxviii: 1 to Saturday evening.

contradiction, as we shall see, and could not in any case be used to invalidate the plain meaning of the earlier passage.

It is quite obvious, as has often been pointed out,[1] that for the form of his note of time here Matthew is dependent on the combined notices of Mark xv: 47 and xvi: 1 f. There the women, on Friday evening, either during or just after the burial, were observing where Jesus had been laid; then on Saturday evening after sunset, it being the first day of the new week, they bought spices, "and very early on the first day of the week they came to the tomb at sunrise."[2] The phrases πρωί and ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου show plainly that a night intervenes between vss. 1 and 2, yet from a superficial reading it might be possible to understand the time indicated in the two verses to be the same, as if the women, having bought the spices, continued their way to the tomb. But the whole transaction would then fall on Sunday morning, not on Saturday night. But xv: 47 tells of another visit of the women to the tomb, this time, as it would seem, on Friday evening, when they observed (ἐθεώρουν) where Jesus had been buried. Our chapter and verse division connects this so closely with the preceding notice of the burial, that we universally understand the time of

[1] *E. g.*, by B. Weiss and Allen *ad loc.*; Lake, p. 57; C. E. Caspari, *Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ*, Eng. tr., 1876, p. 240.

[2] On ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, *cf.* Lake, p. 57. The πρωί might *possibly* be understood in the general sense of *early*, *i.e.*, early on the first week-day, or soon after sundown on Sabbath. Yet this is quite unlikely, as πρωί almost invariably means *early in the morning.*

this visit to be during the interment, or immediately after. This is doubtless Mark's intention; yet it is not definitely so stated, and especially if we read an aorist or perfect verb, with some MSS. and versions,[1] the words indicate only that after the burial the women came out and saw where the tomb was. At any rate, Matthew has divided the notice of Mark xv: 47, having (xxvii: 61) the women sitting opposite the tomb during the burial, and (xxviii: 1) coming out to observe (θεωρῆσαι) the tomb twenty-four hours later, when Mark has them buying the spices. This is the more natural since Matthew has omitted entirely all reference to the buying of the spices and the women's intention to anoint the body. Reasons for this omission we have already seen;[2] to them we may possibly add the guard which, according to Matthew, now surrounds the tomb.[3] Matthew's statement (xxviii:1), therefore, is of the women's visit to see the tomb (Mark xv: 47), at the close of the Sabbath (Mark xvi: 1), as the first day of the week was about to dawn (Mark xvi:2). These notices of Mark he combines, by the aid of his own reflection, into a new statement, by which he synchronises the women's visit with the moment of resurrection.

We next inquire what was observed by the women as they approached the tomb. According to Mark, they saw, at that morning hour, that the stone had been rolled away (ἀνακεκύλισται); according to Matthew they saw, the preceding evening, the stone being rolled away. There was further a great earthquake, like

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 245, note.
[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 185.
[3] But *cf. infra*, p. 265.

the one in xxvii: 51 (both unknown to the other evangelists) a part of Matthew's setting for the great events which were taking place. The women, in Mark, had in perplexity entered the tomb and found therein a young man in a white robe. How long he had been sitting there, or whence he came, Mark does not say. Matthew, picturing a scene of perhaps ten hours earlier, represents this youth as an angel (so Mark meant him to be), whose appearance is as lightning and his raiment white as snow. He is seen to come down from heaven, before the very eyes of the women, his descent being synchronous with the earthquake (γάρ); he goes up to the tomb, rolls away the stone, and triumphantly takes seat upon it. That all this takes place as the women draw near, and is seen by them, is Matthew's plain statement. There is no change of time in the verbs from vs. 1 to vs. 5;[1] it is only the desire to harmonise this account with Mark's that reads the aorists of vss. 2 and 4 as if they were pluperfects, describing events prior to the women's advent, and not as contemporary with the aorists of vss. 1 and 5, between which they intervene. Vs. 5 itself, "The angel answering said to the women: Do not you be frightened," makes no sense at all except as the words are spoken to reassure the women, terrified at the sights and sounds which have just stretched the keepers as dead men upon the ground. The whole of this spectacular description is foreign to Mark; it is Matthew's heightening of the scene, to make it more worthy of Messiah's glorious victory over death. For these

[1] ἐκάθητο (vs. 2) means: he took seat on the stone and remained sitting there during the following scene.

details he has no source save his imagination; the historicity of the scene scarcely demands discussion.[1]

The words of the angel to the women are substantially as in Mark, with the addition of ταχύ, and the omission of καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ in the message to the disciples. The injunction to speed may have no special significance; it is perhaps possible, however, considering also vs. 8 (ταχύ, ἔδραμον), that it has a connection with Matthew's new dating of the women's experience. If the disciples were still in Jerusalem, and received the message early Saturday evening, it might be that with great haste they could reach Galilee and see their risen Master there before sunset of the next day; *i. e.*, the first "appearance" would fall on "the third day." This could be made possible, if at all, only by the rising of Jesus with the first moments of the new day, and the receiving of his message by the disciples as soon thereafter as might be.[2] If this were really Matthew's idea, the one appearance of Jesus to his disciples and, supposedly, his departure or "ascension" would, according to this gospel, fall within the third day, a conception of which there are other early traces. It may, indeed, be doubted whether Galilee could be reached from Jerusalem in—let us say—twenty hours, even with the greatest haste. Josephus remarks that by taking the short route through Samaria, the journey might be made in three days.[3] None the less, of

[1] One notes with astonishment that even Orr (p. 126) doubts historicity here, and suggests that the scene is "a reflection, possibly, of the terrified imagination of some of the guards." What terrified them?

[2] So Brandt, pp. 443 f.; Schmiedel, col. 4072, 26 *a*.

[3] *Vita*, section 52. *Cf.* Keim, vol. i., 1867, p. 307 (Eng. tr., vol. ii., p. 1), note 2.

course, Matthew might have so conceived it. The point must for the present be left doubtful, nor is it here of especial importance; it will meet us again.

The omission of καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ is more significant. The only "appearance" of which Matthew knows is that to the eleven disciples together (vs. 16). In his time the special appearance to Peter no longer figured in the tradition. First and most important of the appearances, it has left the scantiest traces in the written sources. Paul (I. Cor. xv: 5), Mark (xvi: 7), Luke (xxiv: 34) attest it, but have no account of it, though probably the lost ending of Mark had such account. In vs. 8 Matthew offers a deliberate correction of Mark's οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον. He cannot but think of the angel's bidding as fulfilled, and his aorist ἔδραμον posits the errand as completed. He has not, however, any definite tradition of the receipt of such a message by the disciples, and makes no definite statement to that effect.[1] In vs. 16 he goes on, much as the lost end of Mark must have done—save that Matthew *thinks* the departure on Saturday night, and due to the angel's message—to recount how the eleven disciples went into Galilee, and there were vouchsafed an "appearance" of Jesus. Up to vs. 16, with the exception of the grave-watch episode, and one other, to be noted immediately, Matthew has plainly no other source than Mark and his own reflections. We have not found the slightest reason to alter in any detail the picture of events our study of Mark left in our minds.

A really new element, however, is introduced in vss.

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 230.

9 and 10. "And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and took hold of his feet and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not; go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." Here is the first appearance of the risen Lord; it is in Jerusalem, not in Galilee, to two women, not to the disciples. The meeting has no independent content; in passing, as it were, Jesus meets the women, simply repeats to them what the angel had said, and departs, apparently for Galilee, while they resume their interrupted flight into the city. It is impossible not to believe these verses an interpolation into Matthew's original text. The connection, both in thought and in wording, is interrupted; the events otherwise succeed as in Mark, and the αὐτῶν πορευομένων of vs. 11, which follows naturally after the ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι of vs. 8, is very awkward as the text stands. The verb of motion which πορευομένων takes up ought immediately to precede; the reference across the two verses to ἔδραμον is difficult. Surely no one would begin a clause, "and as they go," when in the preceding passage they are not going, but kneeling on the ground clasping Jesus' feet. Moreover, the aorist verb ἔδραμον strictly excludes the interruption of vss. 9 f.; it posits the action as completed. If anything were to occur on the way, the imperfect ἔτρεχον would have been demanded, as in the parallel case John xx: 4, or in Gal. v: 7. The verses have really no attachment to their context on either side; in particular we miss between verses 10 and 11 some conclusion of the episode, some such phrase as "and having said this, he parted from them," or the like. What the verses relate is not what the preceding verses prepared

for, nor has it the slightest relation to anything that follows. The rest of the narrative ignores the episode as completely as does Mark or Luke. So loosely are the verses inserted that they may be removed without affecting any single word of the context, and with positive gain to its clarity. It must also be noted that the MSS. do not agree as to the opening words of vs. 9, where the connection is made with the preceding. The T. R. reads ὡς ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἰησοῦς κ. τ. λ., while W. H., with most modern critical editors, begin with the καὶ ἰδού.[1] The MS. evidence on which these discrepant texts rest indicates at any rate either that the vss. are uncertain, or that early scribes felt their lack of assimilation to the context, and tried to better it.

But quite apart from any considerations of the Greek text it is quite impossible that Matthew should have made so colourless and contentless the first appearance of the risen Master. For him the Messiah is supremely glorious, his resurrection is given most imposing supernatural setting of earthquake and mighty angel with dazzling brow; we rightly expect the appearance of the risen Lord to have dignity and majesty, and his words to be the fitting charge of Messiah to his apostles. The whole effect of the appearance in vss. 16–20 is spoiled if such a casual appearance as that of vss. 9 f. has already taken place. Further, the angel is on the scene, has come from heaven, primarily to give the women a message, and that message is that the risen Jesus will appear to his

[1] For the evidence *cf.* Tischendorf and Meyer–Weiss *ad loc.*

disciples in Galilee. He is declared, indeed, to be already on his way thither (προάγει). The message of the angel is rendered entirely unnecessary if Jesus is waiting just outside to tell the women precisely the same thing. It is absolutely impossible to find room in the clearly expressed intent of vss. 2–8 for the idea that Jesus is still lingering near, that he is to appear first to these women, before that promised appearance in Galilee, that he is himself to repeat the angel's message. No, this appearance of Jesus is clearly only a doublet to the preceding appearance of the angel; it has no point or meaning, serves no purpose. Jesus has absolutely nothing to say except to repeat what the angel has said; his injunction is plainly unnecessary, as the women are already hastening as fast as they can to fulfil their charge. Indeed, the appearance of Jesus only delays them in their mission, and interferes with the angel's admonition to speed. Not to Matthew, but to some interpolating scribe, we must attribute this disturbing intrusion.[1]

That this appearance is historic, therefore, we have no ground for believing. Its entire lack of any inde-

[1] So Rohrbach, *Schluss*, p. 56, *Berichte*, pp. 22 f., 63, 84; Keim, p. 557 (Eng. tr., p. 309); Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 698, *Lukas der Artzt*, p. 157; Stülcken in Hennecke's *Handbuch*, p. 86; Schmidt, p. 394; Le Breton, p. 96; and others. *Contra*, Beyschlag, in *St. Krit.*, 1898, p. 113.

Loofs, p. 17, finds these verses "ein aus andrer Quelle (die eine mündliche sein kann) eingesprengtes Gut . . . das freilich schon der Evangelist hier eingefügt hat." So, in substance, Volkmar, p. 628, and Korff, p. 50. Pfleiderer, p. 600, thinks the vss. original in Matthew's text, but aimless and awkward, and without historic content. Voigt, p. 57, thinks Matthew took these verses from the original end of Mark!

pendent content shows that we have here to do only with a doublet to the appearance of the angel. When it came to be believed that Jesus had not only appeared to his disciples in Galilee, but that his resurrection on the third day had been attested by *his appearance in Jerusalem on that day*, the earlier gospels that had no such suggestion were edited into conformity with this view. Mark suffered mutilation, Matthew, interpolation. Luke and John were written from the new point of view, though John xxi brings also the older tradition. From the tradition that angels had been seen at the empty grave proclaiming the resurrection and promising the appearances of the risen Master, it was a natural development to the tradition that he himself was seen there. But the materials out of which the description of his appearance is made are the phrases used by the earlier tradition for the angel's appearance.[1] Professor Lake's favourite idea that the "young man" of Mark was really a matter of fact young man, and nothing more, who was actually seen and spoken with by the women, leads him to suggest that there were two possible supernatural interpretations of this youthful stranger. One was that he was an angel; the other, that he was Jesus himself. Matthew simply adopts both, by a process of conflation not without frequent parallel in his pages.[2] Whatever of truth there may be in this suggestion, a more plausible explanation and a factor at any rate more influential was the tendency to harmonise the earliest tradition of the appearances with the

[1] So Brandt, pp. 338 f.; Wernle, *Synoptische Frage*, 1899, pp. 176 f.; Pfleiderer, p. 4; and even Beyschlag, p. 435.

[2] Lake, pp. 85 f., 185 f.

later developments. The conception that finds its clearest expression in John xx: 1–18 is the conception that xxviii: 9 f. serves to insert into the gospel according to Matthew. The similarity of phraseology between these verses and John xx: 17 is significant, especially the "go unto my brothers"; nowhere in the gospels, save in these two passages, does Jesus speak of the disciples as his brothers.[1] Aside from this Johannine narrative, the appearance to the women at the grave has the entire gospel account against it. It is excluded by the clear intent of Mark and of Matthew's context, and is distinctly denied by Luke (xxiv: 9–11, 23 f.), where the women return to the disciples with their report of empty tomb and angels, a report regarded as nonsense by the disciples. Even when disciples go to the tomb, "him they saw not." The whole narrative of Luke xxiv: 9–35 is absolutely incompatible with any appearance of Jesus to any of the company before that to Peter (vs. 34). The disciples accounted as "idle talk" reports of angel and empty grave; so soon as Jesus was seen, they were convinced, ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος.

Of the points in which Mat. xxviii: 1–15 goes beyond the Marcan account, certain details are due to Matthew's reflection, the episode of Jesus' appearance is no original part of the text and is unhistorical; it remains to look at one such point, the episode of the watch at the tomb (xxvii: 62–66, xxviii: 4, 11–15). This narrative also fits somewhat loosely into the context, and yet there is no reason for suspecting its place in the

[1] *Cf.* Rohrbach, *Schluss*, pp. 54–57; *Berichte*, p. 84. Mk. iii: 34 f. (=Mt. xii: 49f.) and Mt. xxv: 40 are not analogous. The προσεκύνησαν of vs. 9 is doubtless borrowed from vs. 17.

original form of the text.[1] The connection with the context is established in vss. 4 f. (note the emphatic ὑμεῖς: fear not *ye*, like the watchers) and 11; no difficulties are created for the Greek text, nor is the plain intent of the whole narrative contradicted by this episode. It is true, however, that the episode forms a separate and compact element in the narrative, with no real connections with its other elements; it depends on nothing and nothing depends on it. Though its phraseology has roots, its statements of fact have none. The way in which the actual episode, though it is inserted in three fragments into the context, never actually mingles with the surrounding episodes, is quite extraordinary. It is the only element in the whole narrative which is thus detached. It is, indeed, frequently assumed that there is such mingling in Matthew's omission of the women's intention to anoint the body, that this omission is due to his belief that the tomb was sealed and guarded. But Matthew does not indicate that the women knew this, and the omission is much more probably due to his consciousness of the impossibility of such anointing; the more honourable burial which he supposes Joseph to have provided would also tend to make such subsequent anointing less natural. The λίθος μέγας (vs. 60) would in fact be as effective a barrier as the guard; Mark makes plain that these hindrances were not reflected on in the growth of the legend.

No, this episode is no interpolation into Matthew's

[1] Keim, pp. 523 f., 556–558 (Eng. tr., pp. 270, 308 f.) ascribes the whole episode to the *Überarbeiter* of Matthew, and cites Hilgenfeld and Holsten for the same view. H. A. W. Meyer (5th ed., 1864), *ad loc.*, cites Stroth for this view, and refutes it.

text; he himself interpolated it into the account he received from Mark. It is an element, and an important element, in the Christian tradition of his day. It gives a vivid picture of the polemic and controversy of those years. The Christians urge triumphantly that "God had made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom ye crucified," in proof of which "God raised him from the dead, whereof we are witnesses." And this resurrection from the dead was claimed to have been the rising of his body from its tomb outside the wall of Jerusalem. To this the Jewish opponents, thus accused of having slain Messiah in the person of "Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead," have a sharp reply.[1] They are in no position to deny that the body had disappeared from the tomb, but an easy and natural explanation of the fact lies ready to their hand; the very disciples who so ardently proclaimed that the body was no longer there had themselves the best reason to know why. To such calumny—as in truth it was—the story of the grave-watch is the Christians' answer. The shameful origin of the accusation and the real version of what took place at the sepulchre are set forth with polemic vigour.

"And the next day, which is after Preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees were assembled unto Pilate saying: Sir, we are reminded that that deceiver said while still alive, After three days I rise. Therefore order the grave to be secured until the third day, lest the disciples come and steal him and say to the people, He is risen from the dead, and the last deception will be worse than the first. Pilate said to them,

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 228 f.

You have a guard. Go secure [the grave as well] as you know how. And they, departing, secured the grave, having sealed the stone, with the guard." As the new day came in the angel descended "and from the fear of him the watchers were shaken and became as dead." A little later "some of the guard, coming into the city, announced to the chief priests all that had transpired, and having gathered with the elders and having formed a plan, they gave a considerable number of silver-pieces to the soldiers, saying, Say, His disciples, coming at night, stole him, we being asleep. And if this be heard by the governor we shall persuade [him] and make you care-free. And they, taking the silver-pieces, did as they were instructed: and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews until this day."

The question immediately arises: Is this story true, or substantially true? The only answer can be: It is entirely fictitious. It is from beginning to end without any historical foundation, owing its origin entirely to the controversy with Jewish opponents. In the first place, it must be taken *in toto;* it has no point or meaning without the angel and the earthquake of vs. 2. Professor Orr suggests that the dazzling angel descending from heaven and rolling away the stone may be "a reflection of the terrified imagination of some of the guards."[1] But he quite forgets that the witnesses for this scene are not the guards, but the women. The story told by the guards is an entirely different one. How are we to conceive "some of the guards" telling the Christians about the angel and his action—as they *imagined* him to have looked and acted,—when this is

[1] Orr, p. 126.

precisely the story they have been paid *not* to tell? To say "imagination of the guards" is to make the whole story meaningless; if the guards "imagined" the angel and his action, then the women did not see him, then he was not there at all. Then where is the story? What were ἅπαντα τὰ γενόμενα which the guards told the Sanhedrists? Their imaginings? But what set them to imagining such extraordinary things as angels and earthquakes? *Something* happened; the stone was removed, the Master's body emerged. The watchers did not become as dead men because terrified by their own imaginations. Certainly their story is told by them for literal fact, is believed by the Sanhedrists as literal fact, is related by Matthew for literal fact. There is imagining, but the guards are not the imaginers, but the imagined. The story is all of a piece; the angel cannot be expurgated and leave any content at all in the report the guards are hired to keep secret. As was true in the case of Mark's narrative, one who cannot accept the angel cannot accept the story of the empty tomb at all; without the angel the tomb must remain closed.

But the angel, formidable as he is to modern belief, is the least of the difficulties of this narrative. Every detail is impossible. The note of time at the outset invites criticism; that the Sanhedrists (chief priests and *Pharisees!*) should go in unto Pilate and deliberate with him on the Sabbath, and on a Sabbath which was doubly sacred as being the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, is quite incredible. Even the fourth evangelist (xviii: 28) knew better than that. *And Matthew himself knew better.* His curious phrase: the next day, which is μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, is absolutely

unexplainable except as a conscious attempt to avoid the natural and normal expression: on the Sabbath. He must have the plot made and the guard stationed on that day, because with its sunset comes the critical third day, in whose first moments the Master is to rise. There is no alternative but to violate the Sabbath. We have here another clear indication, in addition to those already given,[1] that Matthew thinks of the resurrection as taking place just after sunset on Saturday evening. Had the next morning been the decisive time, he could have placed the conference with Pilate and the stationing of the guard in the evening, "when the Sabbath was past," and so have avoided all difficulty. But, however awkward the dating, the guards must be there before the Sabbath sun had set.[2] Yet Matthew cannot quite write the bald statement: on the Sabbath the chief priests and Pharisees went in unto Pilate; he compromises by an awkward phrase suggested by Mark xv: 42, "the morrow, which is after Preparation."[3]

Further, the utterance of the Sanhedrists is wholly incredible. They remember that Jesus had prophesied his resurrection after three days, and they understand this resurrection to imply the issuance of the body from the tomb. Believing that the disciples may attempt to counterfeit such resurrection by a theft of the body, they wish the tomb guarded. One at once wonders why this had not occurred to them the day before, when they could have made such

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 250–256.

[2] The guards, then, spend only a period of hours at the grave, and no part of the night.

[3] So Allen, *ad loc.*

disposition of the body, without violation of the Sabbath, as would have made any secret removal impossible. But one wonders more how the Sanhedrists are so familiar with the idea that Jesus predicted his bodily rising on the third day, when no disciple or follower of Jesus had the faintest suspicion of such a thing. If anything is written clearly across all the gospel narratives of the resurrection, it is the fact that no single one of Jesus' friends had the least expectation that the tomb had not closed forever on his lifeless body. They flee the city in hopeless despair, they prepare to anoint the body for its long sleep, they weep and lament the end of their hopes. There is no possible reconciling of the attitude of Jesus' followers after his death with the idea that he had ever promised them that the third day would see him leave the tomb in triumph. When he appears to them—in all this the gospel narratives are being taken as they stand—they are overcome with amazement and terror; they think him a phantom or some deception. Only with the greatest difficulty are they persuaded that it is really he alive again. When they hear from others that he is risen, they reject the statements as nonsense or humbug, even when they are sworn to by their own kin, friends, fellow-disciples. In short, their behaviour is precisely what the behaviour of hard-headed men of London or Chicago would be to-day, were they confronted with similar evidence that some friend whom they knew dead and buried, had come to life and emerged from the grave to revisit his associates.[1] It is

[1] This skepticism of the disciples is to be sure limited to the later gospels, Luke and John, which place the "appearances" in Jerusalem. Yet Mark and Matthew show as clearly that no

nonsense to say that the disciples had not believed, or had not understood, or had forgotten Jesus' predictions. But it is greater nonsense to assume, in addition to this, that the Pharisees had remembered and understood them, and believed the disciples to have remembered and understood them, *without believing!* What a state of mind to attribute to the Twelve—no belief in what Jesus had claimed, yet ready to risk honour and life in a huge lie to make it appear true! Did the Sanhedrists remember the word of Mat. xii: 39 f., spoken to "certain of the scribes and Pharisees"? But Luke xi: 29–32 shows that this word was not spoken by Jesus. If the disciples had no knowledge that led them to expect Jesus' rising from the grave on the Sunday, we may be sure the Sanhedrists had none. The whole story presupposes that the word "resurrection," as used by Jesus and his earliest followers, meant the emergence of the reanimated corpse from the tomb—as it did in the apologetic and polemic discussion of the nineties,—but this supposition we have already discovered a completely mistaken one.

Incredible, further, is Pilate's willingness to enter into such a scheme with the Sanhedrists, especially in view of his friendly attitude to Jesus at the trial. The guard (κουστωδία *custodia*), also, which is at the disposal of the Sanhedrin (ἔχετε),[1] to which it must report (xxviii: 11), though composed of Pilate's soldiers,

---

resurrection from the grave was expected. How all this is reconciled with the undoubted fact that Jesus *did* predict his resurrection, we shall see later. It is, at any rate, absolute disproof of the calumny of "the Jews" and Reimarus.

[1] ἔχετε κουστωδίαν could not possibly be read as imperative, ever in the absence of xxviii: 11.

(xxviii: 12–14), does not belong to history. The Jewish leaders have authority over the guard, they seal the grave as safely as they know how, they are responsible for the whole double plot; all this reveals the growing tendency, strong in Matthew but much stronger in Luke and John, to exculpate Pilate and put all the blame on "the Jews." Here again the story evinces itself as a part of the apologetic and polemic of the years of contest.[1]

But most incredible of all are the statements of xxviii: 12–15. The guards report earthquake, angel, and resurrection, *and the Sanhedrists believe them!* None the less they hope to defeat God's plan, in the face of this tremendous and direct attestation to Jesus' Messiahship, by bribing the guards to tell a false story! And what a story! First the guards are to accuse themselves of falling asleep on their watch, all of them, with not one awake to rouse his fellows at any disturbance. They are to sleep so soundly that the disciples can come to the tomb, break the seal, remove the stone, and carry away the body, without a single guard being awakened. And none the less, when they awaken and find the stone lying flat and the body gone, they are to know precisely what took place during their extraordinary slumber! Thus are the precautions of the Sanhedrists and Pilate to come to nothing, because of the extreme drowsiness of these Roman soldiers!

The Sanhedrists, assembled in council, deliberately concoct this supremely foolish story and give the soldiers a "sufficient number of silver-pieces" (ἀργύρια ἱκανά) to make them willing to tell it. Naturally the

[1] *Cf.* Merx *ad* Mat. xxvii: 65.

soldiers fear that if they so assiduously declare themselves one and all to have slept on guard, the affair may be brought to a hearing before their military chief (ἀκουσθῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος), but they are comforted by the assurance that more silver-pieces will be forthcoming to induce Pilate to wink at their fault. To recount the details of this story is to produce the strongest evidence against its historicity. That the accusation of having stolen the body is made against the disciples only in the polemic of later years is clear from the simple reflection that had it been made soon after "the third day" the disciples would inevitably have been arrested and tried for their crime. Any suggestion of the sort is significantly absent from Acts' account of the early days. The accusation and its rebuttal in the gradual growth of the grave-watch legend belong to the later years, when ἀνάστασις has come to mean something done by the buried body, when the parties to the dispute are far removed in thought and conception, as well as in time and space, from the men of Jerusalem in the year 30. Here, then, Matthew has added no new item of fact to Mark's account. The guard at the tomb has precisely the status of the earthquake or the angel's descent from heaven; it is but an embellishment of the original picture, an element quite secondary and unimportant in the general complex of traditions.[1]

[1] So very many, *e.g.*, J. A. W. Neander, *Leben Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 1845, p. 768 (note); H. A. W. Meyer, *Krit. Eg. Handbuch über Matthäus*, 5th ed., 1864, pp. 607 f. (one regrets to see this entirely omitted in Meyer–Weiss 1898); Keim, pp. 523–525, 556–558 (Eng. tr., pp. 270 f., 308 f.); Rohrbach, *Berichte*, pp. 78–83; Brandt, pp. 329–336; Reville, vol. ii., pp. 457–459; Schmiedel, col. 4065; Arnold

Meyer, pp. 107–109; Lake, pp. 178–181; Korff, pp. 18–20. Reville (*New World*, Sept., 1894, p. 514, *J. de N.*, p. 462) suggests that the reminiscence of armed men seen going to the grave (in Reville's view sent by the Sanhedrin and Pilate to remove the body) may be responsible for originating the legend of the guard. That the watchers were really Jews, acting under Jewish orders, not responsible to Pilate, he finds suggested by the notice in the Gospel of the Hebrews, that Jesus on rising gave his *sindonem servo sacerdotis*. Similarly Merx *ad* Mat. xxvii: 65, with the excision of xxviii: 14 and reading "guard" instead of "soldiers" in xxviii: 12. B. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, 1882, vol. ii., pp. 594 f., 610 f., denies the historicity of the grave-watch, but dates too early the controversy which gave rise to the story. Baldensperger, p. 21, note 24, dates the origin of the legend shortly before the year 70. It is to be dated rather after than before this date. Besides Matthew and the possible, but very doubtful, reference in the Gospel of the Hebrews, the story appears, among early sources, only in the Gospel of Peter.

CHAPTER IX

GALILEE

WE come at length to Matthew's account of the "appearance" of Jesus in Galilee. It is placed at "the mountain where Jesus had appointed them," a phrase which has been a frequent source of perplexity, since there is nowhere the statement that Jesus had specified a mountain as the place where his disciples should see him. But this is not at all what is meant; the real significance of the words is: the mountain where Jesus had given them appointment as his disciples and bidding as to their work.[1] The reference is to Mark iii: 13 f., "And he goes up into the mountain (εἰς τὸ ὄρος) . . . and he appointed (ἐποίησεν) twelve, whom also he named apostles," etc. To be sure, Matthew (x: 1 f.) has separated the appointment of the Twelve from the scene on the mountain (v: 1 f.), but he could easily remember the original connection in Mark, which he himself had altered. τάσσω used absolutely would take a dative,

[1] B. Weiss (Meyer–Weiss, *ad loc.*) and Brandt (pp. 354 f.) have a similar suggestion, but would take *ἐτάξατο* here as meaning "gave them the laws of the Kingdom," *i.e.*, spoke to them the Sermon on the Mount. So Völter, p. 34. *Cf.* Holtzmann, *H. C.*, *ad loc.* *Cf.* also Lake, p. 90, and J. Weiss, *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 373, both of whom weigh the suggestion, but reject it. Volkmar, pp. 240 f., saw most clearly here.

"gave appointment to them," like the parallel ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις of Acts i: 2 and τοῖς πνεύμασι ἐπιτάσσει of Mark i: 27. But the direct antecedent in Matthew's own gospel for the phrase here is the words διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ in Mat. xi: 1, which form the conclusion of the scene which the evangelist has in mind in the words ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησούς of xxviii: 16. Mat. x: 1–5 is directly dependent on Mark iii: 13–19, as a comparison of the phraseology conclusively shows. Mat. xi: 1 (διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα) sums up the preceding chapter. xxviii: 16 refers directly to xi: 1 with its ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς, and still has in mind chapter x. The mountain thus appears in the first and last terms of this series (Mark iii: 13; Mat. xxviii: 16), and is no doubt vaguely present in the writer's mind, though not explicitly mentioned, in the middle terms (Mat. x: 1 ff. and xi: 1). Thus is relieved the difficulty which practically all commentators have found with the *rendezvous*, as it is usually considered, without basis in the text, of xxviii: 16.[1]

What is in Matthew's mind is the striking parallel between the two scenes. Months ago, in Galilee,

[1] Pfleiderer, p. 601, says, "Wir uns hier zum Schluss noch einmal auf derselben *idealen* Höhe befinden, wie zu Anfang bei der Bergpredigt und in der Mitte des Evangeliums auf dem Berge der Verklärung." Korff, pp. 27 f., goes quite astray here, and his translation "die Berghöhe, *wohin* sie Jesus beschieden hatte," is quite an unjustifiable rendering of τὸ ὄρος οὗ κ.τ.λ. Voigt, p. 64, sees that the mountain of the great sermon is meant, but thinks of an appointment thither, justifying the rendering of οὗ as *wohin* from Lk. xxiv: 28, ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο. I. Cor. xvi: 6, οὗ ἐὰν πορεύωμαι, might also suggest *wohin*, but neither passage makes that rendering plausible in Mat. xxviii: 16.

Jesus called unto him his disciples on a mountain-top, there chose from the number of μαθητάι twelve whom he named ἀπόστολοι, and giving them authority over evil spirits and human ailments, sent them out to preach the gospel of the Kingdom. Their field of labour at that time was to be, not the way of the Gentiles nor any city of the Samaritans, but only the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to whom also he had been sent (Mat. xv: 24, peculiar to this gospel, as is ix: 36, where the same expression occurs). But now it is no longer Jesus of Nazareth, it is the risen Messiah who calls his apostles up into the mountain. Now all authority has been given unto him in heaven and upon earth; his influence is to be limited no longer to the lost sheep of Israel's household, to whom, in earthly life, he had been sent. His messengers are to go forth to all the nations, making them disciples to his name and in his name baptising them.[1]

Thus Matthew parallels, in splendid fashion, the two *Aussendungen* of the disciples, one to the cities of Israel, one to the nations of the world. Historically, of course, his presentation expresses the truth. The living Jesus of Nazareth felt himself sent to his own people; his message was for them, his dream of the kingdom and his own part in its establishment had meaning only for them. His conscious horizon was not really wider than Israel. But the Providence that guides the history of man would not have it so; the Jesus who was a prophet to Israel died, the Christ who meant the renewal of humanity arose in his stead. The Christ whom Paul preached to a Gentile Christen-

[1] On the trinitarian baptismal formula, *cf. supra*, p. 165, note.

dom for whom the law had ceased to be was the risen Christ; Christ after the flesh was no more known. And so it was when Matthew wrote. We ought to have done with the pedantic criticism which places xxviii: 19 beside x: 5 f. and argues Matthew in hopeless contradiction with his own fundamental convictions. That no man can easily be. Matthew indeed did not see clearly the full force of Jesus' Galilean utterances or their relation to the later world-mission of the church, but he was honest enough to report those earlier, more limited utterances, as his sources gave them to him, even though the church of his time, and himself as a part of that church, had long since departed from their literal observance.[1] Mat. x: 1 f. is the utterance of Jesus, as he could alone have spoken; xxviii: 19 is the utterance of the real gospel of Jesus breaking through the bonds of its relation to a single spokesman, as it embodied itself in the church of the century's closing years, in Matthew as one voice of that church. xxviii: 18–20 are not literal words of Jesus, spoken to the Eleven after the resurrection; they did not stand in the "Logia" of Matthew the disciple. But they are ideally true to the history of the church of the first century.[2] In and

[1] Of course the church of the earliest years remained true to the original utterances, and only a half-century's struggle, with Paul as protagonist, brought the church to the point where she could utter the words of Mat. xxviii: 18–20. If these words have their origin in the time immediately after Jesus' death, whether on the lips of the risen Lord or in the conviction of his disciples, the book of Acts and every epistle of Paul must be rewritten.

[2] Holtzmann, *H. C.*, *ad loc.*, "übergeschichtliche, ideale Wahrheit."

through the church Jesus was uttering precisely these commands, and they were being heard and gloriously obeyed.[1]

What of the historicity of the other details, then,—the mountain, the appearance of Jesus, the doubt of some? As we have already seen, all the earliest tradition points to an "appearance" of Jesus to the disciples in Galilee. So much Matthew knows from the tradition; so much, indeed, Mark tells him. But Matthew has no written source for this appearance, neither the original end of Mark nor another.[2] There are no details, save that of the place. The Eleven "saw him" (ἰδόντες αὐτόν); he "came up to them" (προσελθών); these two participles furnish all the description Matthew can give. They are his own words; they witness only to his entire lack of any account of the "appearance." Still the dominant verb is *see*. The voice of vss. 18–20 is the voice of the Church. "They fell down before him" (προσεκύνησαν) is Matthew's own word, the natural expression of adoring reverence.

The phrase "but some doubted" (οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν) is difficult. The words have no connection with the context, either backwards or forwards. That the Eleven had followed the bidding of the angel, and had come to Galilee and assembled at the mountain, is proof that they believed Jesus risen and expected to see him. When they saw him they fell at his feet in worship; surely there is no room in προσεκύνησαν for doubters

[1] On these words as the voice of the church, *cf.* Brandt, pp. 358–361; Arnold Meyer, pp. 139–156; Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 306 f.

[2] So, *e.g.*, B. Weiss, Meyer-Weiss, p. 506, note.

that it was really Jesus.[1] And those who are addressed in the following words are not in the slightest degree those who think they may be victims of a hallucination or a deception. The phrase fits awkwardly, also, into the Greek text; οἱ δὲ properly demands a οἱ μὲν before the preceding verb.[2] "Some" can hardly refer to less than three of the company, which would leave only eight believers. It is difficult to persuade one's self that Matthew really thinks of this "appearance" and the lofty words which accompany it as vouchsafed to three doubters and eight who believe. In short, it is not easy to avoid the thought that here is an interpolation into Matthew's original text.[3]

There is, perhaps, less conclusive ground for the judgment of interpolation here than in some other passages, yet awkwardness of Greek text, lack of relation to context and adequate motive are all in evidence, and combine to make a consideration of real weight. For the motive of the insertion is clear, whether Matthew's pen or another's is responsible for it. One of the strongest apologetic motives of the later time was the insistence that the disciples *did*

[1] So clear is this that it is often suggested that others besides the Eleven were present, that, for example, the appearance to the "five hundred brethren at once" belongs here. See this presented with great fulness of creative fancy in Latham's curious harmonisation, *The Risen Master*, pp. 277–294.

[2] *Cf.* Reville, *J. de N.*, vol. ii., p. 437.

[3] So especially Brandt, pp. 355–357; also H. Zimmermann, *St. K.*, vol. lxxiv. (1901), p. 449, note 2 (including vss. 18–20); J. Weiss, *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 373. *Contra*, Loisy, vol. ii., p. 747. The fathers liked to minimise the "some" to one, identifying the doubter with Thomas or Philip. *Cf.* Zahn, in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. xiv. (1903), p. 806, note.

not believe easily. Just as Matthew's story of the guard at the tomb lets us see one item from the disputation of the years toward the century's end, so Luke xxiv: 11, 36–43; John xx: 24 f., let us see another. The Master arose from the dead, for his disciples and friends saw him, was the claim. "Yes," was the skeptic's reply, "*his disciples and friends* saw him, precisely those who were prepared to see him. Convinced in advance, these gullible disciples were far too uncritical to give their testimony the slightest validity for us." To this the inevitable answer was the insistence that the disciples were far from gullible, that they did not believe at first sight, because of their "will to believe"; on the contrary, they were hardheaded and skeptical too, most critical, and believed only after absolutely convincing proofs.[1] There are several noteworthy things to be observed concerning this apologetic motive.

First, it is absent from the testimony of Paul, of Mark, of Matthew (save for οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν). *I. e.*, it appears (in the N. T.) only in the latest gospels, Luke and John. Second, it appears only in those narratives which make literal earnest of the idea of the revival of the actual buried body, and emphasise this material element most strongly (*e. g.*, Luke xxiv: 36-43, John xx: 20–31). Third, it appears only in connection with the claim that the "appearances" of Jesus were in Jerusalem rather than in Galilee. We have here one of the many indications of the strange relationship (as yet unexplained) between the third and fourth gospels; to enter upon that problem would lead us far afield. What concerns us here is to observe the combination of elements that go to make up what we may

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 270.

call, for convenience's sake, "the Jerusalem tradition." These elements are, to recapitulate, emphatic insistence on the material nature of the resurrection-body, as absolutely identical with the buried corpse, on Jerusalem as the scene of the appearances, on the disciples' unwillingness to believe without overwhelming evidence.

This tradition *shaped* the resurrection-narratives of Luke and John. We have already seen it at work on the earlier gospels, removing the end of Mark and substituting another passage in its place, inserting the appearance to the women into Matthew (xxviii: 9 f.). There is surely no valid reason for refusing to see it at work here, inserting the words οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν. The words may originally have been a marginal note, by a scribe familiar with the other tradition as written in Luke and John, and later embodied in the text.[1] They do not necessarily mean, when separated from the context, "and some doubted," but may be rendered "and they doubted"; the scribe, that is, wished to note the general fact, clear to him from Luke and John, that the first appearance of Jesus to the disciples was met with doubt and distrust. This *motif* of the disciples' doubt, which is surely unhistorical, will concern us again when we come to the consideration of the "Jerusalem tradition" in Luke.

There remains to be considered, of Matthew's account, only the mountain. The one "appearance" of Jesus which Matthew knows, that to his disciples in Galilee, takes place upon the mountain where, some months before, the Master had given appointment to these disciples, and had laid down the constitution of

[1] So W. H. van de S. Bakhuyzen, *Over de Toepassing van de Conjecturaal-Kritiek op den Tekst des N. T.*, 1880, p. 138.

the Kingdom of God. Is this a happy literary construction of Matthew, or was there a tradition to that effect? It is natural and intelligible as a literary construction; great events of this sort, especially where a being from the skies has intercourse with men, are most fittingly located on a height rising from earth toward heaven. The transfiguration, for example, could hardly take place anywhere else than on a lofty height, so the temptation of Jesus to make the kingdoms of this world his own.[1] In particular, however, must the ascension of Jesus from earth to heaven be from a mountain-top; it is the inexorable demand of congruity. The ascension of Jesus is pictured only once in the New Testament (Acts i: 6–12) and there, naturally, as succeeding the last of the "appearances." Matthew knows of but one appearance; he has no word of what succeeded it, but in the background of his thought lies inevitably the idea: after thus speaking, Jesus departed from the summit of the mountain into heaven. Matthew knows of no other appearances, of nothing to keep Jesus longer on the earth; moreover, the content of the Master's words here is in substance the same as that of Acts i: 8, words spoken just before the ascension, and "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," are plainly words of farewell. In short, the mountain here is the product of Matthew's literary skill, influenced by the idea that after Jesus' appearance and charge to the disciples, he went away into heaven, and that, naturally, from a hilltop. This hilltop the evangelist then conceives, as we have already seen, as the same on which these disciples first received the apostolic call. We are, therefore, unable

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 38; Brandt, pp. 353–355.

to find anything of history in this notice, and must be content to remain in ignorance of the place in Galilee where Jesus' followers saw him after his death. The mountain will concern us again in our discussion of Luke's narrative.[2]

To Mark's account of the resurrection, then, Matthew added the episode of the guard at the tomb, but did not otherwise materially enlarge the tradition. The angelic message in Mark, as well as the primitive tradition, told him of an "appearance" in Galilee. This he chronicled, in the briefest and simplest fashion, his chief interest thereby being in the apostolic commission from the Master's lips for the conversion of the world. It is notable that the specific first appearance to Peter, listed by Paul, promised by Mark, noted by Luke, is not referred to by Matthew. The καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ of the angelic message in Mark is significantly omitted, and the τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ receives the entire emphasis. There seems to have been no written account of the appearance to Peter, except as it was briefly chronicled in the lost end of Mark. Its significance, from our point of view, is supreme; Luke xxii: 32 has well expressed it, "Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren." Peter's experience, that gave to one man the absolute assurance that Jesus had risen, paved the way for the similar experience of the others. Yet it had not the same significance for the early church as the appearance which sent eleven men out into the world as the apostles of

[2] *Cf. infra*, pp. 349–352, 405–407. It may seem as if two separate origins have been assigned to the mountain here. The origin of the mountain is suggested above; its identification with "the mountain where Jesus appointed them" is explained on pp. 275 f.

the risen Messiah. These two appearances were both part of the primitive παράδοσις (I. Cor. xv: 5), but it was on the second of the two that all the emphasis was laid. Out of the first a man was reborn; but out of the second the church sprang into life. Of the first only that it had occurred was remembered and related; the second all the evangelists (surely including Mark) aimed to present. For the earliest church it was the great, almost the only, appearance. The later ones—to Stephen, to James, to five hundred brethren, to various apostles, to Paul—were of importance individually; they had not the same pragmatic significance in the original establishment of the church.[1] The same is true of the appearance to the Emmaus disciples in Luke, and even more so of that to Mary Magdalene in John. So this one chief appearance to the Eleven, and this alone, Matthew presents. He knows nothing of Jesus appearing again and again, for a period of days; once the disciples saw their Master, received from him their commission, and the heavens received him.

If one asks whether Matthew has forgotten the importance of Peter in the critical days that followed Jesus' death, the answer is at hand. He could not have overlooked in Mark xvi: 7 the καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ which he omits. Matthew rarely forgets anything, and what he omits in one place he brings in another. So here, as little as Luke (xxii: 32, xxiv: 34) has forgotten what Peter was and did, though he has no details, so little has Matthew. Does he not put into Jesus' mouth at Cæsarea Philippi words which no other evangelist knows, which have fixed for the tradition of twenty centuries the fundamental place of Peter, behind his

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 136–139.

ten colleagues, as the firm base on which the gradual structure of the Christian church arose? "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona. . . . Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (xvi: 18 f.). Those words have in them the sound of the farewell charge of Messiah to the apostle whose faith is to be the first firm foothold for the feeble church, on which it shall come to itself and begin to live.[1] What those words say is in very truth the consequence and meaning of the ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, and Matthew is not ignorant of it. With that utterance already chronicled, he can spare the καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ when he reaches it.

All in all, then, except for the story of the guard Matthew stands about where Mark does as to the materiality of the resurrection-body. He takes it for granted that what happened when Jesus "rose" was that his body came out of the tomb. "He is not here; come see the place where he lay." And yet he has not constructed his narrative consistently with this view. *He allows no opportunity for the body to emerge.* The angel descends, removes the stone, and takes seat upon it. This is before the women's eyes, according to Matthew's thought; they are the only witnesses of these prodigies he is relating, and of the stunning of the guard. The frequent assumption of commentators, that the women arrived after the event, to find the watchers lying in a

[1] *Cf.* Rohrbach, *Berichte*, pp. 55–58. B. W. Bacon, in *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1909, p. 295, argues that the reference to the "gates of Hades" which had closed upon the crucified Jesus, only to reopen for his escape on the third day, indicates that Mt. xvi: 18 f. was originally a post-resurrection utterance.

stupor and the angel sitting on the stone, is a flat contradiction of the text. The angel's μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς is intended to keep them from such alarm at the astounding sights and sounds as has overthrown the guards.

The rolling away of the stone, which the women, therefore, see, has for its only object the affording possibility of exit for the body. Neither Mark nor Matthew thought of the removal of the stone in any other connection; as long as the stone covers the door the body is still in the tomb. But none the less, when the stone is rolled away nothing happens; the body does not come forth. The women who look on in wonder see only the triumphant angel, who none the less immediately proclaims: He is not here, he is risen. Hither, see the place where he was lying. When did he rise? we ask. Not before the women's arrival; this would place the resurrection before the third day. Not before the stone was removed, else there would be no motive in the removal; the rising would in this case not be of the material body, which would be left behind, still to be seen in its place. If we say that the stone is removed, not to let Jesus out, but to show the women that he is no longer there,[1] we are introducing an evidential motive into the action, quite foreign to the thought of any New Testament writer or any early Christian. And the very fact that the body is not there shows that the rising has been material, requiring the opened tomb-door as its indispensable condition. Then did Jesus rise after the rolling away of the stone? No, the women would have seen him coming forth; Matthew would have shown

[1] So Samuel Horsley (Bishop of St. Asaph), *Nine Sermons on . . . . . our Lord's Resurrection*, 1815, p. 202. *Cf.* Lake, p. 251.

his graphic descriptive power in one of his supremest scenes.

As a matter of fact, the author is involved in an inner contradiction; his conception is confused and blurred. The actual ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν was an invisible transaction, not the act of flesh and bone: that original consciousness is still with him, in some degree. The "appearance" of Jesus on the mountain he does not think in material, physical terms. But the body was gone from the tomb, otherwise there were no resurrection: that idea also controls him. And he does not attempt to reconcile the two points of view.[1] Of course no such reconciliation is possible, yet Matthew is not clearly conscious that any is needed. He is less sensitive to contradictions and confusions of narration than either of the other synoptists. In Luke and John, where the apologetic motive for insistence on physical characteristics in the risen body is so much stronger, we have the contradiction made much sharper and more distinct. These writers deliberately think together the two things—a flesh and bone body which can walk, talk, and eat, and a psychic form which can appear and disappear at will on either side of closed doors. Matthew has not yet reflected on the point; he does not really think of the material body passing through the stone. He brings an angel to roll the stone away, as some helpful commentators open the door for Jesus in the narrative of John xx: 19. With Matthew the question: Real body or phantasm? was not a burning point of controversy, as it was with the other two, as the accusation that the disciples stole

[1] *Cf.* a similar criticism of Matthew's representation in Pfleiderer, p. 599, and in *Supernatural Religion*, pp. 830 f.

the body was for him. As to the nature of the risen body, his conception is unreflecting and naïve. He makes no attempt to describe in physical terms the body in which Jesus "appeared" on the mountain; only in the body's disappearance from the tomb does the physical element enter his narrative.

It is a remarkable tribute to the power of the original conception that neither Matthew nor any other New Testament writer attempts to describe the resurrection itself. No one of them ever brings himself to say, in so many words: the body of Jesus came to life and emerged from the tomb into the open air. Although all believe that the body did come forth, none, apparently, deliberately thinks it out and pictures to himself the scene. First the prostrate form, wrapped in the winding-sheet, motionless and silent; then movement, a stirring of the limbs, the body rises to its feet, casts off the sheet, and as the stone crashes away from the door amid the thunders of the earthquake, the naked form strides out into the world in triumph! To sketch such a picture is to show that no evangelist so completely and consistently thought out the scene whose actual occurrence he was so ardent in proclaiming. We find the tomb empty, we hear the angel's ἠγέρθη; we are not present at the crowning moment. Even in Matthew, where it would seem inevitable, the event strangely fails. We have the moment before, when stone and body are undisturbed; we have the moment after, when "He is risen"; but *the* moment we have not. This is not Matthew's art, as is often claimed, it is his artlessness. It is the final and irrefutable proof of the original definition of ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν as concerned, not with grave and garden, but with Hades and Heaven.

BOOK FOUR

THE WITNESS OF LUKE

CHAPTER X

OUTSIDE THE CITY

THE gospel according to Luke comes from an unknown Gentile author writing not far from the year 100. The real Luke (Col. iv: 14; Phm. 24; II. Tim. iv: 11) is related to the double work of this author (Gospel-Acts) as the real Matthew is related to the first gospel, or Peter to the second, as a source of material embodied in the second half of the work. Writing not much later than "Matthew" in point of time, the writer whom we may continue to call Luke represents a very considerable further development in the progress of the tradition. His environment is very clearly another than that of Matthew; the exigencies of the controversy are very different. To meet the apologetic needs of this varying situation, the tradition has developed in a somewhat different way and is calculated to meet different criticisms. Whereas in Matthew the apologetic interest is centred in what happened at the grave and the circumstances under which the body left its place of burial, in Luke the interest centres on what this risen body did later,

and the evidential exhibition of its material qualities. Matthew lavishes his chief miracle on the appearance of the angel to open the tomb; Luke is very restrained at this point (xxiv: 1–3), and keeps his greatest marvel to adorn the appearance of Jesus himself to his followers. For Matthew—as indeed for the primitive believers—the wonder was *that* Jesus rose; for Luke it is rather *how* he rose, with what body he came.

And so Luke is very thoroughgoing in his complete adoption of the view that the physical body rose. He is not disturbed by any lingering traces of the idea of transcendent "appearances" of the glorified Master from the splendour of his heavenly life; the disciples see and have converse with the very tangible flesh and blood and bone which had been buried. *A dead man come to life* in all form organises his propaganda. And Luke sees that the consistent acceptance of this view demands that Jesus be seen in Jerusalem, not in Galilee.

Critics commonly think of Luke as deliberately altering the tradition, by substituting for the Galilean account of his predecessors one at variance with it.[1] This is really doing Luke an injustice. As a church historian he is, to be sure, controlled by a homiletic and apologetic purpose. It must further be granted that he is under the dominance of a theory about the origins of the church. The striking thing, in his eyes, about the growth of the Christian movement is the fact that it was no sooner born and established in Judaism than it began to go out therefrom, radiating,

[1] Korff, pp. 77 f., represents Luke as familiar with the original end of Mark, with its account of Galilean appearances, and as deliberately contradicting it, knowing Mark to be in error.

as from the centre of a circle, to all the world. In Luke's time the church is at home in all the world, save only in Palestine, its πάτρις. Both the gospel and the Acts Luke writes with the spell of this phenomenon strong upon him, with a desire to set it forth in clear outline, to explain and justify it, as a significant element in the divine plan. So in the gospel Jesus begins his mission in Nazareth, his πάτρις, and is rejected. Coming to his own he is not received of them. The words of his discourse to his townsfolk (Luke iv: 25–27) transcend the situation in which they are uttered, and parallel the arguments by which Luke in the pages of Acts justifies the turning of the gospel to the Gentiles.[1] As the preaching of Jesus must begin in Nazareth, so the apostolic proclamation must begin in Jerusalem, as the nation's capital and religious centre. The parallelism is close and significant. Galilee would by no means have answered the purpose; it could not have stood, as Jerusalem can and does, as equivalent to Judaism, land and people. That the nuclear point out from which the church starts on its victorious career in the world is Jerusalem, rather than Galilee or any other part of Palestine, is unquestionably a piece of Lucan ideal history, rather than a chronicle of fact. The point will concern us again.[2]

None the less, Luke means to be honest with his sources and with the facts so far as he can ascertain them. His vision of the beginnings, sixty to seventy years before he writes, is of course not wholly clear, despite his claim to have "traced the course of all things accurately from the first." The church as his

[1] The notable parallel is the speech of Stephen, Acts vii: 2–53. *Cf.* Pfleiderer, p. 487.

[2] *Cf. infra*, pp. 383–386.

investigation first reveals it had its historic centre in Jerusalem, with Peter and James at its head; this same church he knows as the outgrowth of the resurrection conviction among these men and their associates. The experiences which gave these men this great conviction he naturally places in the locality where these experiences bore fruit in the first Christian congregation. Who was to tell Luke otherwise? The tradition had not preserved, as a fixed part of the παράδοσις, the place of the appearances (*cf.* Paul's statement!), as indeed, why should it? The fact was the thing which had gospel value; the place had none. We must always keep in mind the entire lack of interest, among the early Christian teachers, in mere biographical or historical detail. The tradition was sermon-stuff; its values were homiletic. Only use in preaching kept the tradition alive at all, and such elements as, in the view of these primitive preachers, lacked value as texts, were soon lost.

Here and there persisted the reminiscence that the appearances had come to Peter and the rest *in Galilee;* everywhere was related that the appearances *had come.* Mark, of course, knew the truth about it, from his intercourse with Peter and the rest, and, in the words of the angel's message, he certifies to the true place. Matthew takes this reference in Mark at its face value, and repeats it; he has no other authority than Mark's statement for placing the appearance in Galilee. Luke is limited to the single sentence, "He goes before you into Galilee, there shall ye see him" (Mark xvi: 7), as authority for Galilee as the scene, and that is but a promise, of whose fulfilment he finds no account. For Luke's copy of Mark ends with xvi: 8 and, as we

have seen, lacks xiv: 28.[1] Matthew Luke has not read. Paul, even if Luke has read his letters (it is almost an absolute certainty that he has not), has no information on the point. "Go tell his disciples and Peter" would indicate that the Eleven were still in Jerusalem, where the women could communicate with them. Where is the proof that they left the city? Indeed, is there not an indication in Mark's closing words that they did not do so? The women said nothing to any one, did not deliver their message, thinks Mark. Surely, then, the disciples, lacking any knowledge of the resurrection and any bidding to return to Galilee to see the Master, would lack all motive for departure; they would remain in the city to be startled by appearances of Jesus there. To be sure, Luke is absolutely certain that the women did relate their experience to the disciples, but, in his view, there was nothing in the report which necessitated departure from the city. If, even in Mark, no message to go to Galilee was delivered or acted upon, it is probable that none was sent; in any case, Mark does not compel belief that the disciples did return home. Luke's correction of Mark, as he understands him, is only as to the message, not as to the action of the disciples. The field is really clear for Luke's construction, and he boldly and conscientiously makes it, not doing violence to his sources as he reads them, not consciously substituting one account for another, but attempting to reconstruct the actual course of events, and set it in order, that the most excellent Theophilus (and others) might, amid the diversities of tradition, know the certainty of these things.

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 195–201.

There is, however, a further weighty reason why, in Luke's thought, Jesus was seen by his followers at Jerusalem rather than in far-away Galilee. It is because it is so important, in his view, that what the disciples saw was the actual physical body of Jesus, restored to life. This motive is largely unconscious with him, but is none the less very influential. Where one thinks of appearances of a glorified spirit-body from heaven, place does not matter; Jesus may be seen as well in one place as another. But where one thinks of a corpse reanimated, coming out of its tomb and showing itself to friends, at once the place is fixed; that body cannot be indifferent to spacial limits. Precisely as in Matthew (xxvii: 52 f.) "the tombs were opened and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised, and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection, they *entered into the holy city and appeared* to many," so for Luke the body coming out of the tomb cannot go far from its sepulchre. Matthew does not for a moment think of his two scenes xxviii: 17 ("when they saw him") and xxvii: 53 ("many bodies of the saints appeared to many") as analogous; *for Luke's view they would be perfectly analogous.* There would be something grotesque and unthinkable in the journey of that scarred and wounded form, those pierced feet, over the long miles of mountain and valley to Galilee. The walk to Emmaus or Bethany is the utmost limit. Of course Mark and Matthew had not interpreted the προάγει in any such literal sense; Luke could not easily do otherwise. It is not to be supposed, indeed, that Luke thinks out the matter in any such clear way; it is only that his conception of the revival of the buried body inevitably

confines the activities of that body to the neighbourhood of the tomb.[1]

And so we have the "Jerusalem tradition" with its natural origin in the growing thought and apologetic discussion of Luke's environment, not in any capricious will to make a violent change in the received tradition. The chief elements in this view of the resurrection-story, all having their origin in apologetic motives, are, as we saw, first, emphasis on the identity of risen body with buried body; second, Jerusalem as the scene of the appearances; third, the disciples' slowness of belief. How these motives come to expression in Luke's narrative, we shall now proceed to see.

We may begin with the account of Jesus' burial (xxiii: 50–56). Here we find closer following of Mark than in Matthew. Joseph is a βουλευτής, but Luke infers from the fact that he buried Jesus a certain sympathy with Jesus' person, and adds, therefore, "He had not consented to their counsel and deed." This is not history, nor has Luke a source for it; it is his independent reflection. It does not, indeed, imply that Luke thinks of Joseph as a Christian, as Acts xiii: 29 is enough to show. The εὐσχήμων of Mark Luke renders by ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος, a fuller expression of the Christian's appreciation of the Jewish councillor's kindly deed. The same tendency that made Matthew describe the tomb as new makes Luke describe it as one "where never man had yet lain." He does not state the tomb to have been Joseph's own, but apparently takes this for granted. The stone at the door, perhaps inadvertently omitted in the burial scene, appears in xxiv: 2. The women are not

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 129.

named at this point, but are described as those who had come with Jesus from Galilee (*cf.* viii: 2 f.); they "followed after and beheld (ἐθεάσαντο, from Mark's ἐθεώρουν) the tomb and how his body was laid." *I. e.*, they are actually witnesses of the burial, whereas in Mark it is not clear that they are. Returning to their lodgings, they prepared spices and ointments, this, of course, before the actual beginning of Sabbath. That is Mark xvi: 1, with the point of time placed a little over twenty-four hours earlier.

The women are quiet through Sabbath according to the commandment, but on the first day of the week, at deep dawn (ὄρθρου βαθέως), as in Mark,—Luke really makes no use of Saturday evening—they come to the tomb with the spices which they have prepared. There is in Luke no perplexity as to how the stone is to be removed; the women's intention, though not definitely stated, would preclude such perplexity. No strange phenomena greet the women as they approach the tomb, save that the stone has been rolled away from the entrance. The women enter, but find not the body.[1] No strange sight or sound greets them; only the Master's form is no longer there. In all this Luke is not really reflecting to any degree on the narrative; he reproduces Mark without appreciable change, for his prime interest is not in the tomb and the departure of Jesus from it. That he takes for granted; that is not the theme of controversy. A little closer consideration would have found matters here to be made

[1] Wellhausen, *ad loc.*, thinks εἰσελθοῦσαι an interpolation. We will here pass over the less important details of conjectural and other text criticism offered by Wellhausen, Merx, and other commentators.

clearer; the stone would have been put in after xxiii: 53, the motive of Joseph more definitely indicated, the plan of anointing stated and related somehow to the closed tomb, the removal of the stone more accentuated, and the like. We have seen in Matthew how these details were treated by one whose interest was keenest here.

With xxiv: 4 we reach the point where Luke begins to do more than reproduce his sources, where he shows original thought and construction, as he approaches that part of the narrative which for him is of keenest import. As the women stand lost in perplexity over the disappearance of the body, suddenly there appear two men standing before them (ἐπέστησαν, the men were not there as the women entered, but "came and took their stand"). These ἄνδρες are, for the women and for Luke, of course, ἄγγελοι, wearing brilliant (ἀστραπτούσῃ, flashing like lightning) raiment, and the women in terror bow their faces to the ground. The question why Luke has two angels, when his source Mark told of but one, has received some attention,[1] but is really not of great importance. The sending of two "messengers," instead of one, is a natural literary device, often repeated in both Testaments, to give dignity and importance to the errand or message. So Luke uses it here, as he does in Acts i: 10, to fit the weight of the communication about to be made. The two angels here find their precise analogue in the "multitude of the heavenly host" who praise God at Jesus' birth (ii: 13).

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Brandt, p. 322; Lake, p. 67. Völter, p. 17, thinks the two men are Moses and Elijah, brought here from the transfiguration story.

The actual announcement of the angels is new in content. The first thing that strikes our attention is that it contains no message at all to the disciples; it is only an assurance of the resurrection to the women themselves. This is a deliberate correction of Mark. The source told of an angelic message to the disciples that they were to go to Galilee to see the risen Master. Yet the source declares that the message was not delivered, and it is clear (to Luke) that the disciples did not go to Galilee. The source must be in error; the man who has studied all things carefully from the first and is trying to bring order out of the confused tradition, cannot tolerate an angelic message which was neither delivered nor obeyed, *and which did not correspond with the facts*, as he understood them. It is much more likely that Mark was mistaken than that the angel was! So the whole announcement is reworded, and the allusion to Galilee is used in an entirely different way; instead of ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε καθὼς εἶπεν we have, in effect, αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε καθὼς εἶπεν ἐκεῖ. We are, of course, not to look for any "source" for this change, outside Luke's own honest critical reflection. "Why seek ye him who is alive among those who are dead? Remember how he spoke to you being still in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered over into the hands of sinful men and be crucified and the third day rise."[1]

[1] The οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη of vs. 6, adopted by Tischendorf, bracketed by W.-H., is probably a scribal interpolation from Mark. No motive can be assigned for its omission from the western text, and it is not in the least necessary to the context. The women already know that οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε; the angels will but speak words of mild rebuke, which this explanatory phrase interrupts.

It is clear that what we have here is in substance a reproach to the women, and through them, to all the followers of Jesus. The women, and the disciples, ought to have known, from Jesus' own words, that he would rise, and not be found in the tomb. Why, then, are they looking for him there? Again, then, we see Luke's interest at work shaping his account. The angels do not appear to announce the resurrection; they do not announce it, indeed. The women see for themselves that Jesus is risen; the angels appear to rebuke them for finding it necessary to see for themselves. *That* Jesus rose is not the proposition Luke is here defending, not the declaration he summons two angels from heaven to make, with emphasis, to a skeptical world. That message is, or ought to be, self-evident. The angels are the impressive spokesmen of Luke's rebuke to the unfaith of his time.

The reference to Jesus' prediction of his passion and resurrection is a general statement (ὡς, not ὅτι), without direct reference to specific passages in this gospel. There is, therefore, no point in indicating that neither Luke ix: 22[1] nor xviii: 32 f. are spoken in Galilee. Luke's reading of Mark had made him familiar with the fact of such predictions during the Galilean ministry. Mark x: 33 f. is not necessarily spoken beyond the Galilean frontier, though perhaps Luke (xviii: 32 f.) takes it as spoken nearer Jericho. But Mark ix: 30 f. belongs definitely in Galilee, and that is the passage most important for Luke's reference here. His parallel, to be sure (ix: 44), is abbreviated, but it contains a closer approximation to the angel's quotation (ὁ υἱὸς

[1] Luke gives no local setting for this saying, but Mark (viii: 31) puts it at Cæsarea Philippi.

τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων = τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν) than either of the other predictions of the passion in Luke's text. But the context in Luke ix: 44 f. is enlarged over its source Mark ix: 30 f., and this enlargement makes it seem still more probable that a connection exists between xxiv: 7 and ix: 44. Mark has, "The Son of Man is delivered into hands of men, and they shall kill him, and having been killed, after three days he shall rise. And they were ignorant as to the utterance (ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα), and were afraid to interrogate him." Luke has, "Put *ye* (ὑμεῖς emphatic) into your ears these words, for the Son of Man is going to be delivered into hands of men. And they were ignorant as to this utterance, and it was hidden from them, that they should not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask him about this utterance." In the abbreviation of the prediction (for which no reason is apparent) Luke has made the disciples' ignorance of its meaning incredible, and he well explains that the meaning was (supernaturally) hidden from them. But Jesus' insistence that the word should be firmly stored in the memory, along with the statement that none the less the disciples failed to grasp its significance, makes us suspect that we are to meet τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα again, in the later narrative. It is the angels who call our attention to it, with their reproachful μνήσθητε. Does any scoffer, then, say that the disciples might easily fancy or believe Jesus risen because he had declared that he would rise, expectancy, credulity, imagination working the miracle? Luke's answer is ready. Jesus had so prophesied, indeed, but the disciples had entirely failed to grasp the meaning of his words, words

plain enough, to be sure, but their understandings were holden. They had forgotten his words so far that they went to seek him in his grave after the time when, in fulfilment of his words, he had risen. His words were recalled and understood only when repeated by rebuking angels at the empty tomb.

This is the first appearance of one of Luke's main *motifs*, the difficulty with which Jesus' followers were persuaded that he had risen. Any later inquirer who finds the resurrection hard to believe may comfort himself by the reflection that it was no less hard for the apostles themselves, and the evidence that was sufficient to convince them may convince him too. This *motif* comes out much more strongly in what follows. "They remembered his words, and returning [from the tomb],[1] announced all these things to the Eleven and to all the others." Note how the women's terrified flight in Mark is replaced by the colourless ὑποστρέψασαι —not there lies Luke's interest. Then follow the women's names, given by Mark at the beginning of the scene, an arrangement followed by Matthew. Into the detailed discussion as to the discrepant number and names of the women we need not enter. Mary Magdalene and "Mary of James" are repeated from Mark (xvi: 1) by both Matthew (xxvii: 56, xxviii: 1) and Luke (xxiv: 10). But Mark's Salome is not repeated by either, and the mention of Johanna is peculiar to Luke (xxiv: 10, viii: 3). Verse 10 is exceedingly awkward and its text is not quite certain; a relative (αἵ) before ἔλεγον is imperatively needed to make a readable sentence, but this, though adopted

[1] Omitted by the western text.

by the *Textus Receptus*, seems not to have adequate MS. authority.[1]

The important point is that Luke distinctly presents as the original witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus a larger company than the two or three women, and the Eleven, known to Matthew and Mark. The women are defined (xxiii: 55) as "the women which had come with him out of Galilee," a palpable reference to viii: 2 f., where are mentioned Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, "and many others." So here (xxiv: 10) are cited Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary of James, "and the other women with them"; a numerous company is intended.

But the group that receives the women's witness is also a larger one than the Eleven cited by the other synoptists. "They told all these things to the Eleven *and to all the rest.*" Later (xxiv: 13) two of "the rest," not of the Eleven, start for Emmaus. Returning with the news of their vision of the Master, they "found the Eleven gathered together, *and them that were with them*," and to this larger group the Master presently appeared, thus vouchsafing to the two from Emmaus a second appearance within a few hours (xxiv: 33 ff.). That this enlargement of the circle of primitive witnesses has pragmatic value for the author, that it reflects an interest which he strongly feels, is obvious. These things were not done in a corner, he will say; the original witnesses were many, the original skeptics,

[1] Wellhausen, *ad loc.*, rejects the whole verse as interpolated. B. Weiss, *Die Vier Evangelien*, etc., 2d ed., 1905, p. 447, puts a full stop after *αὐταῖς*, and begins the next verse: "And they said these things unto the apostles, and these words appeared unto them," etc.

whom only reiterated evidence finally convinced, were a numerous company, not limited to the personal disciples, whom affection or enthusiasm might delude.

Against the possibility of such delusion vs. 11 testifies. "And these utterances appeared before them as raving (λῆρος is more than 'nonsense'; it is the senseless utterance of one in delirium, one who knows not what he says; Latin texts have *delira*, *deliramentum*), and they gave the women no credence" (ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς). Here the *motif* of the disciples' skepticism comes to extreme expression. A numerous company of women assure them of a personal experience, of what they have seen and heard, and the reply is "Raving." This motive will concern us soon again.

Verse 12 is an interpolation, as the MS. evidence shows.[1] It is not in harmony with the immediately preceding judgment of the disciples, and interrupts the connection between vss. 11 and 13; δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν needs an antecedent verse in which the group of men is mentioned. Nor does the content of vs. 12 agree with vs. 24 with its plural ἀπῆλθάν τινες; this verse would be differently worded by Luke had he already written vs. 12. Verse 24 forms the suggestion for John xx: 3–10, which passage, in turn, caused a scribe to insert xxiv: 12 in his text of Luke. It may properly

[1] *Cf.* the note in W.-H., *Notes on Select Readings*, Tischendorf *ad loc.*, and the commentaries. The verse is rejected by B. Weiss, Holtzmann, and Wellhausen, *ad loc.*; Schmiedel, col. 4041; Arnold Meyer, p. 39; Lake, p. 95 (doubtfully); Korff, p. 22; Voigt, p. 66, and many others. It is ardently defended by Merx, part ii., second half, pp. 520–523, 533; also by Brandt, pp. 342 f., and Keim, pp. 554 f. (Eng. tr., pp. 305 f.).

be objected that vs. 24 demands a prior notice of such a visit to the tomb; yet vs. 12 is very ill adapted to serve as such antecedent, and the Emmaus incident is so distinctly a separate element in the Lucan summary of traditions here that we cannot hope to fit it smoothly into the rest of the narrative. If vs. 24 demands an antecedent, how much more does vs. 34!

The Emmaus episode is the most perplexing and obscure of all the incidents of the resurrection narrative. An episode to which there is not the faintest allusion elsewhere in the New Testament, it is recounted with a literary grace and charm which appeal to every reader. We can but agree with Brandt that here we see "the genius of Luke in his best hours."[1] The incident is clearly of the very greatest importance for the evangelist; it occupies one half of his entire resurrection-narrative, and is recounted at far greater length than any other incident of the period, with far greater minuteness and emphasis of detail. The two men whose experience is here related must, then, have a peculiar significance for Luke's interest.

They are not, however, men we have met before, or shall meet again. Only one is named; of their personalities or their histories, either prior to this incident or subsequently, we learn nothing. Despite the fact that the fullest revelation of the risen One is theirs, that to them alone, save to Peter, is granted a double "appearance," they have no place in the book of Acts among the witnesses of the resurrection. Clearly they are of significance, not in their specific persons, but as *representatives*. They are the representative

[1] Brandt, p. 365. *Cf.* Pfleiderer, p. 468; Arnold Meyer, pp. 36 f.; J. Weiss, in *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., pp. 482 f.

members of the larger circle referred to in vss. 9 and 33. Luke is saying that not only the eleven apostles who had been Jesus' close companions, but less intimately related men as well, had been convinced of the resurrection, not easily, but absolutely.

Not here for the first time does this larger company appear in Luke's pages; it was already present in Galilee. To it belong the mysterious Seventy (x: 1), who appear and disappear so abruptly, whose number is the number of the nations, who are not called "apostles," and yet are "sent out" precisely as the Twelve are, with the same commission, and perform the same work (x: 17). Such a larger group, indeed, "companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John," says Peter in Acts i: 21. The "us" of this utterance means primarily the Eleven; the company present, about a hundred and twenty "brothers," two of whom are named, Joseph Justus and Matthias (vss. 15 and 23), belongs to the larger group. These men, too, are qualified to become "witnesses with us of his resurrection," and any one of the number, as the lot might fall, might be "numbered with the eleven apostles" (vss. 22 and 26). They must, therefore, have seen the risen Master, must have heard his teachings, companying with the Eleven "unto the day that he was received up from us" (vs. 22). Verse 13 would seem to indicate that Luke does not conceive them as gathered with the eleven (vs. 6) at the final ascension, and the occasion "when he was received up from us" (vs. 22) refers, like the close parallel in vss. 1 f., to the *first* ascension, where the larger group was present (Luke xxiv: 33, 50 f.). The parallel to Acts i: 6–9 in

Mat. xxviii: 16 ff. has also only the Eleven present.[1] But this larger company of disciples is present on the third day when the Lord is taken up, and on the day of Pentecost its members share in the outpouring of the Spirit and its manifestations (ii: 1-4).[2]

Here we have one of Luke's prime apologetic motives, the presentation as the original group of witnesses to the faith, the nucleus of the Christian church, of not merely "the Twelve Apostles," whose traditional standing he would indeed do nothing to depreciate, but of a considerably larger group of men and women, who can give authority and stability to the nascent movement. The Twelve Luke reveres as highly as does any evangelist, but he is sadly conscious that of any activity on the part of most of these men he and the church of his time are totally ignorant. How gladly would he have written "The Acts of the Twelve Apostles"; what he does write is "The Acts of the Apostles Peter and Paul." There is the chronicling of the death of James Zebedæi (xii: 2); there is entirely contentless mention ("and John") of John's name eight times; but aside from these two brothers and Peter, "the Twelve" do not appear in the pages of Luke's history.[3] Instead, the great apostle whose exploits form the bulk of the book's material is Paul; with him are associated Barnabas, Apollos, Timothy, Aquila, and Priscilla, and a goodly number more, all flying back and forth, up and down the Mediterranean world, busily weaving at the growing fabric of the Christian church. And just there lies the explanation

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 362.

[2] *Cf.* Brandt, p. 377.

[3] After the list of names in i: 13. Of course such a general reference as vi: 2 is not excluded.

of Luke's limitation. These are the men who actually had made the church which Luke knew; these are "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" upon which the holy temple has risen.[1] Where are Andrew and Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, and James of Alphæus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas of James? Luke does not know, precisely as you and I do not know. They did not make the church, at least, the church of which Luke was a member, which has persisted to our time.[2] Luke, precisely like ourselves to-day, looks up at "the Twelve" as an august fixed, but unknown, quantity; he cites their names with veneration, but they are not, save Peter and the sons of Zebedee, *personalities* to him. The church in which he and the excellent Theophilus have their religious home is a structure reared in the extra-Palestinian world by other hands than theirs.

We have here, in short, Luke's fundamental thesis, a thesis which the history of the church and its actual status in his time forced upon him, that the Christian gospel, coming into the world, uses Palestine and Judaism only as a point of departure, as a vantage-point from which to "get a good start" for its triumphal course in the world. Messiah is born as a Jew, he gives his teachings to Jews, he collects Jewish disciples, to be sure, but this connection is only temporary, the securing of a foothold in the world. The gospel meets no real response in Judaism, it makes no conquest there. "He came unto his own, and his own received him

[1] The contrast of Eph. ii: 20 with I. Cor. iii: 10 f. at once dates both Acts and Ephesians.

[2] We must, indeed, not forget Matthew's great service in collecting the λόγια τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

not." The sons of the kingdom had the good news offered them, but they rejected it; then, clean from their blood, it turned to the outer world. Luke, through the mouth of Paul and Barnabas, speaks out boldly and declares to the Jewish race, "'It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth. . . . Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles: they will also hear.' . . . And as the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God, and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was spread abroad." (Acts xiii: 46–48, ... xxviii: 28).

That may not be a literally correct report of the words of Paul and Barnabas; it is an absolutely correct report of the course of the gospel in the first half-century of its life. This is easily the most striking fact in the whole history of Christianity, quite as much so for us as for Luke. That the Messiah should come, the fulfilment of an age-long hope of Israel that was absolutely national in its origin and significance, that he should be born a Jew, live a Jew, and die a Jew, never leave Palestine or attempt to transcend its horizons, should preach to Jews, and leave his work in the hands of a group of Jewish disciples, and yet within half a century his movement should be a world-religion, uprooted from Palestine, divorced from all connection with Judaism, *and that the transfer should have been*

made by Jews,—this is one of the supreme marvels of history. Only familiarity prevents our perpetual wonder. Luke devoutly, inevitably, sees in it the divine ordering, the Lord's doing, marvellous in our eyes, and who shall fail to agree? This great fact absolutely dominates Luke's consciousness, and all his thought of the gospel and its career in the world. It shapes his whole presentation, from the stories of Jesus' angel-heralded birth[1] to the triumphant point where, Paul having been carried to the world's capital as a result of the Jews' vain spite, the gospel, in his person, definitely and forever turns from them to the nations of the world. That is the grand climax of the marvellous process Luke writes to describe; there sounds most clearly the note to which the whole work has been attuned.[2]

But all Luke's prior narrative has been dominated and shaped by the same thought, and not least the account of the resurrection and the experiences consequent upon it. The connection must be established between those primitive experiences in which the church was born and the line of development which led to the church Luke knows. The experiences of the Eleven, especially of the Ten (without Peter),[3] even-

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, ii: 29–32: "Mine eyes saw thy Salvation which thou didst prepare before the face of all the peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and a glory of thy people Israel."

[2] Thus are answered all questions as to the "abrupt ending" of Acts.

[3] Of course Peter also was most influential in the forming of the Palestinian church, but Luke counts him on the other side. It is only because he opens the way to the Gentile mission that Peter figures in Acts at all. As important only for the Jewish church,

tuated in the building of the Jewish-Christian church of Palestine, which is fading from Luke's horizon. Its path of development has ended in a *cul de sac*, so far as his vision reaches. It did its work and had its day, which Luke is not concerned to depreciate, but for the apprehension of the great Church, it has ceased to be.

There must be a true apostolic succession from the risen Master to Luke's church. There must be another company of witnesses, whose authority and connection with the events must be as unquestioned as those of the Twelve. Hence the Seventy, numbered as the nations of the world, who are sent by the Master "*before his face into every city and place whither he himself was going to come.*" Hence "all the rest" who, with the Eleven, hear the women's report of the empty tomb (vs. 9) and that of the disciples from Emmaus (vs. 33), who share in the visit from the Master himself, hear his instructions, receive his parting blessing, behold his ascension, receive the outpouring of his spirit, become his witnesses and the builders of his church. They too must see Jesus risen and have special instruction from his lips, and this they do in the persons of Cleopas and his companion.

These men receive what is perhaps the first appearance; at least it precedes that to the Eleven: its only competitor for the first place is the appearance to Peter, too firmly fixed in the tradition as the first to be placed definitely later. Luke, indeed, has no con-

---

he would have failed like Andrew, or at most had the place of James or John. Acts has no real "characters" except those significant for the Gentile mission. *Cf.* Stephen, or Philip!

cern to subordinate Peter, since for him Peter belongs not with his ten colleagues to the Jewish group which came to naught, but to the group of apostles who built the world-church. Peter shares with Paul the honour of having transplanted the young gospel into the new soil; indeed, he takes the initiative in the process (Acts x). Luke never forgets the amazing fact that the severance of Christianity from Judaism was accomplished by men who were Jews, and Barnabas and his colleagues from Cyprus and Cyrene are at the work before they summon Paul (Acts xi: 19–26). But Luke knows that, none the less, it was not the appearance to Peter which had prime significance for the great church; it was the appearance to Paul, of which he cannot make enough, relating it with great elaboration and emphasis of detail three times over (chs. ix, xxii, xxvi). Peter's vision of the sheet (x:1—xi:17), related twice in extreme detail, is really more *significant* in Luke's story and for his purposes than Peter's vision of Jesus risen, on which he bestows two words (Luke xxiv: 34).

In the literal sense, of course, Luke's presentation does not correctly represent the facts; in the large sense it perfectly represents the fact. It was *not* the experiences and activities of the Ten that shaped the church of the century's end; it was the experiences and activities of Paul and Barnabas and Timothy and Silas, of Apollos, Aquila and Priscilla and their like. Luke's construction is precisely upheld here by the witness of Paul. The Christian proclamation, as handed down by the earliest disciples to Paul, was: "he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve." But that was not all the story. "Then he appeared to above

five hundred brethren at once, then to James, then to all the apostles, last of all to me." Paul gives the historic fact of experiences which connected a large number of brethren and apostles with the resurrection and the inception of the church. Luke gives a construction of this fact in a narrative whose details are shaped by apologetic and legendary considerations, but which sets forth the same truth. The five hundred brethren did not merely see the Master and go their way, any more than did all the apostles, or Paul himself. They became, of course, a strong element in the growing life of the Christian movement. Luke, then, though he may know nothing of the experience of the five hundred, has good support for his hundred and twenty brethren and the "others" whom he pictures companying with the Eleven.

We have made an extended *excursus* into Luke's purposes in order that we might understand the story of the Emmaus disciples. In their persons the larger group of Jesus' followers receives the appearance of the Master, and is given instruction from his lips. Living connection of this larger fellowship with the living Head is established, *not mediated through the Twelve.* Earlier in time than the appearance to the Eleven, that to these men is more kindly and more intimate, though in both the Master's teaching is in substance the same. The story as it stands is Luke's creation; he has no written source for it, and no oral tradition of its details. The traditions and conceptions of his environment furnish the suggestions for his narrative, which he constructs in order to present in complete and intelligible fashion an important truth of the church's life.

"And behold two of them"[1]—the antecedent of the αὐτῶν is found in the subject of ἠπίστουν in vs. 11; it is correlative with the αὐτῶν of that verse—"on that very day"—for this appearance must be early, and on the significant third day—"were going to a village distant sixty stadia from Jerusalem, whose name was Emmaus." The identification of this village has furnished an insoluble problem for all exegetes from Eusebius down. The question is unimportant; since the incident is not historic, there is no decisive reason why the village should be. If an actually existent village of the name is meant, el Kubeibeh, about sixty-three stadia, or seven miles, west-northwest of Jerusalem, seems to be the most likely of proposed sites.[2]

"And they were conversing with one another concerning all these happenings. And it came to pass, as they conversed and discussed, Jesus himself, approaching, was going along with them. And their eyes were held not to recognise him." Here we have that other apologetic motive of Luke, the lack of belief at the first sight of Jesus. It must be emphasised, yet it must be explained, and the explanation here is pre-

[1] So the Seventy, a part of this same circle, go out by twos (x: 1).

[2] So Plummer, *ad loc.*; Baedeker's *Palästina und Syrien*, 3d. ed., 1891, p. 18; H. Zschokke: *Das N. T. Emmaus*, 1865. Most others prefer Kulōniyeh, about thirty-five stadia, or four miles, from the city. So Keim, p. 555 (Eng. tr., p. 306); C. E. Caspari: *Chronological and Geog. Introd. to the Life of Christ*, Eng. tr., 1876, p. 242; Arnold Meyer, p. 133; Lake, pp. 99 f. *Cf.* Merx, *ad loc.* Voigt, pp. 75, 113, thinks Emmaus is no town, but the ancient "Fountain of the Sun," En-Shemesh (Josh. xv: 7, xviii: 17), where he places an inn.

cisely what it is, for example, in ix: 45; the divine action prevents their perception.

"And he said to them, What are these words which you exchange with one another in walking? And they came to a halt, with gloomy faces.[1] And one of them. by name Cleopas,[2] said unto him, Art thou the only one sojourning in Jerusalem and not acquainted with what has taken place in it in these days? And he said to them, What? And they said to him, The things concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who became a prophet powerful in work and word in the sight of God and all the people; how our chief priests and rulers delivered him up to the condemnation of death, and crucified him." This is one of the numerous passages in which Luke declares directly that it was the Jews who had really murdered Jesus. The necessities of controversy have led him to make this point too prominent, and to view Pilate in too friendly a light, but the essential fact remains. The whole narrative of the trial and passion Luke has rewritten from this point of view,[3] but Mark makes the fact equally plain.

[1] For the variant readings *καὶ ἐστε σκυθρωποί*, and simply *σκυθρωποί*, *cf.* Tischendorf, and against the *ἐστάθησαν* reading, especially Fr. Field: *Notes on the Translation of the N. T.*, 1899, p. 81, and Merx, *ad loc.* The Syriac (both Sinaitic and Curetonian texts) has: "What are these words you speak being sad," both *περιπατοῦντες* and *ἐστάθησαν* being unrepresented.

[2] This is a pure Greek name, the short form of Κλεόπατρος, and as such has significance for Luke. It has nothing to do with the Aramaic Clopas of John xix: 25. So Holtzmann and Plummer, against Zahn *et al.* What Brandt, p. 379, suggests as to the symbolic value of this name is nonsense. Less so, Pfleiderer, p. 468.

[3] This is the standing phraseology of Acts, *e.g.*, ii: 23, 36; iii: 13 f., 17; iv: 10 f.; v: 30; vii: 51–53, etc.

"But we were hoping that he was the one who was to ransom Israel. But furthermore, with all this, it is now the third day since these things took place."[1] Here the disciples are remembering the predictions of Jesus' resurrection, which they ought logically to quote; the allusion is unintelligible to a stranger without explanation. "But also certain women of our number amazed us; having been at dawn to the grave"—we miss an antecedent reference to the burial, nor is it stated whether ὀρθριναί signifies "to-day at dawn" or "yesterday"—"and not having found the body, they came saying that also they had seen a vision of angels, who affirmed him to be alive. And some of those with us went off to the tomb and found it to be as the women said, but him they did not see." Here again we miss the antecedent notice to which this last item refers, and the omission is indeed strange, but not so strange as the failure of any antecedent for the ὤφθη Σίμωνι of vs. 34. It has, indeed, been suggested that vss. 22–24 are an interpolation, like vs. 12, on the basis of the Johannine story.[2] In truth the σκυθρωποί would be more in point if the complaint ended with vs. 21, and the following rebuke would be more natural. But there is no manuscript authority for omitting the verses, and vs. 22, in particular, has every internal indication of genuineness. Vs. 13 plainly implies that the two men were of the company that heard the women's report.

"And he said to them, O unintelligent and slow in

[1] The construction here is obscure, but the sense is clear. *Cf.* the commentaries.

[2] Wellhausen, *ad* Luke xxiv: 34 f. J. Weiss: *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 483, would excise vs. 24.

heart to believe in all that the prophets spoke. Was it not necessary that Messiah suffer these things and enter into his glory?" A defence of the passion lies in these words, but no allusion to the resurrection, save as "enter into his glory" is a general expression for the passage from death into the heavenly life. "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Here is the guarantee that the gospel of the founders of the great church is authentic and true to the Scriptures in which it was foretold, despite every Jewish-Christian claim to the contrary. Here is a claim kindred to Paul's boast, "I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i: 11 f.). So the Emmaus disciples get their gospel and its Scriptural basis directly from the risen Lord himself, and not through any mediation of the Twelve. That claim could have been made, surely was made, by many besides Paul; by the five hundred brethren, by some part of "all the apostles." Luke here makes it for all these men in the persons of Cleopas and his companion.

"And they drew near to the village where they were going, and he made as though to go farther. And they urged him, saying, Stay with us, because it is towards evening, and already the day has declined.[1] And he entered in to stay with them." Luke evidently thinks of the two men as at home in Emmaus,

[1] There is a possible influence here of the phraseology of Judges xix: 8 f. So Brandt, p. 365.

and of this as their dwelling, though in vs. 30 Jesus acts as the house-master. "And it came to pass, when he had reclined with them, taking the bread, he blessed, and having broken, he was distributing to them. And their eyes were opened and they recognised him; and he vanished from them." Here the supernatural influence by which their eyes had been holden is removed, and they know who has been their teacher and illuminator. It is implied that they would have known Jesus had not the spell been laid upon their eyes, that is, that they had had personal acquaintance with him before his death. So definitely in Acts i: 21 f.

The way in which the spell was loosed is extremely significant. It was the κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου which brought recognition. It is not probable that Luke is here reflecting that these men, though not present at the last supper, had frequently seen Jesus break bread at common meals with his followers (Luke ix: 16). He is intent on saying something less prosaic. Not only had Jesus walked and talked with these two men, and taught them the deeper things concerning himself, he had celebrated with them the Eucharist, the dearest sacrament of the Church. "The breaking of bread" (vs. 35) became practically a technical term for the Lord's Supper, and is so used by Luke again in Acts ii: 42, as is the phrase κλᾶν (τὸν) ἄρτον in ii: 46, xx: 7 and 11, I. Cor. x: 16. It is notable that the verb κλάω is not used in the New Testament except in reference to the bread of the Eucharist.[1] The nouns κλάσμα (used only of the fragments remaining after the feeding of the

[1] The language of Mark viii: 6 ff. plainly shows the *agape* as the model for the story of the feeding of the multitude, and Acts xxvii: 35 consciously reproduces the same eucharistic language.

multitude in the desert) and κλάσις (only in Luke xxiv: 35 and Acts ii: 42) have the same limitation of usage as their verb.

For the Christians of Luke's time, it was precisely in the mystery of the Supper that the believers drew closest to their Master and found his most intimate presence revealed. Then, as at no other time, did they apprehend his very bodily presence. Better than all visions, a privilege which put them on an equality with those who had companied with the Master in the flesh, the Supper was the very opening of their inward eyes, the revealing to their spirits of the object of their adoring love. And this revelation, most intimate, most deep, most tender, Cleopas and the other had experienced. No higher, truer revelation could come to any believer, any apostle, than this. The Master had both taught them of his truth and ministered to them of his sacred presence. So the great builder of the world-church cries "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? . . . Are they ministers of Christ? . . . I more! . . . I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord." But the humblest member of that church may reply, "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" If to the founders he had appeared in vision, to every believer he was known in the breaking of the bread. The consciousness of the Church that on these two means of revelation of the glorified Master her life was founded and is perpetually renewed and continued, Luke brings to exquisite expression in the story of Emmaus.

"And they said one to another, Was not our heart heavy as he was talking to us on the road, as he opened

to us the Scriptures?" The reading *heavy* is to be preferred here to the usual *burning*, though καιομένη has the better attestation in the Greek MSS. The Syriac (Sinaitic and Curetonian), supported by the Sahidic and (in substance) by the Armenian, has *heavy*, the Syriac words for *heavy* and for *burning* differing only in the position of a dot. So also the Aramaic יקיר, yaqir, *heavy*, differs only slightly from יקיד, yaqid, *burning*. The confusion, that is, occurred in an Aramaic or Syriac version, not in the Greek text. Yet the Greek text is not without evidence of it. Codex Bezae has κεκαλυμμένη, *coöpertum*, and old-Latin MSS. have *excaecatum*, *optusum*, *exterminatum*, blinded, dulled, made senseless. The Syriac influence on the Western text offers still an unsettled problem, and the interrelations of readings here are difficult to unravel.[1] But the internal evidence is conclusive for some word meaning *heavy* or *dull* as the original, probably either βραδεῖα or βαρεῖα. The process by which almost all our Greek MSS. came to offer καιομένη cannot be traced here; perhaps it cannot be traced at all. But the reference is plainly to vs. 25 and the Master's reproach "O senseless and slow of heart to believe" (βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν), a reproach which the two men are here simply repeating. "Oh, how stupid we were, not to understand that it was he!"—that is the clear and evident sense. "Our heart burning within us" would indicate some premonition or suggestion of the truth, which is quite opposed to the

[1] *Cf.*, *ad loc.*, Tischendorf, W.-H.'s note, Plummer, Wellhausen, and especially Merx. Also Agnes Smith Lewis: *Translation of the Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, 1896, *ad loc.*

intent of the context. They heard his words of instruction as to Messiah and his way of entrance into his glory, they understood his meaning, but not once did it occur to them: this is He. They ask him to remain with them as an act of hospitality, never dreaming they are entertaining Messiah unawares. He is not in any degree known to them until "the breaking of the bread." "Their eyes were holden that they should not know him" over the entire period covered by verses 15 to 31, until "their eyes were opened." How natural their self-reproachful repetition of the Master's rebuke. Luke elsewhere has the phraseology: the heart made heavy, dull. *Cf.* xxi: 34, μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν.

Here is, in short, another statement of that slowness to believe in the resurrection and Messianic exaltation of Jesus, which is one of Luke's strongest apologetic motives. There was some strange stupor over the disciples' senses, as there had been at the great crises of the Transfiguration and the agony in the garden (ix: 32, xxii: 45 f.), when they were weighed down with sleep.[1] And this torpor of their understandings had not been mere stupidity on their part; it had been a supernatural influence, a part of the divine plan for assuring to the world beyond all shadow of doubt that Jesus had been "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection of the dead." So in ix: 45, the plain declaration of Messiah's passion "was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it," so their eyes are holden and their hearts are slow, so

[1] These two scenes have further parallelism for Luke, *e.g.*, the prayer of Jesus, ix: 28, xxii: 41.

the resurrection message is to them but the senseless raving of half-mad women.

Especially important for Luke, and for all other early Christian apologists, was the explanation of the fact that, with the Old Testament and all its rich Messianic prophecy before them, Jesus' earlier followers had not seen in him the fulfilment of the promise. How clear it was to the apologists, *e. g.*, to Matthew, that even the most trivial details of Jesus' experience fitted perfectly the prophetic picture! This generation of Christians was no longer conscious that it was only *after* he had been "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection of the dead," that the process of adjustment between his career and the Scriptures began. Not that any coincidence between the prophecies and what he did suggested his Messiahship, but his Messiahship once established on other grounds, the prophecies, of course, *must conform.* It was the Resurrection which opened to them the Scriptures, and beginning from Moses and all the prophets interpreted the things concerning him, their Lord and Christ. Of this fact no one of the evangelists was fully conscious, yet it shines through their narratives at more than one point. For example, in Mark ix: 9, after the chosen three disciples have beheld Jesus transfigured in celestial glory, with Moses and Elijah, the Master charges them "that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of Man should have risen from the dead." We may be sure that this injunction was obeyed. Very significantly the parallel in Luke (ix: 32) represents the disciples as "weighed down with sleep" at this great moment; so is explained their lack of entire comprehension. In

many passages the same motive comes to expression. John xx: 9 has it in clear wording, "As yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead." In xx: 20–23 (=Luke xxiv: 41–49) they come to know it.

"And arising[1] that very hour they returned to Jerusalem"—apparently they had intended to remain in Emmaus, that is, they were not members of the group fixed in Jerusalem (vs. 49, Acts i: 4)—"and found assembled the Eleven and those with them"—note the constant presence of the larger group to receive this third witness to the resurrection—"saying, Truly [ὄντως, really] the Master arose and appeared to Simon." The abrupt and unrelated insertion of this latter clause into the context forms a point of difficulty both for the text and the narrative. Codex Bezae here offers one of its unique readings, having λέγοντες instead of λέγοντας, thus making the two Emmaus disciples instead of the Jerusalem group announce the Master's rising and appearance to Simon.[2] This would seem to imply that Simon was the name of the disciple who accompanied Cleopas. No other MS. has this reading, but the Syriac (Sinaitic and Curetonian) is not decisive as to the case of the participle, and the same is true of some of the old-Latin MSS. More striking, however, is the fact that Origen seven different times gives the names of the two Emmaus disciples as Simon and Cleopas. Simon is always named first, and the names are brought in quite natur-

[1] The Western insertion λυπούμενοι, *tristes*, *contristati*, after ἀναστάντες has all the context against it.

[2] Loisy ii., pp. 766 f. and Wellhausen, *Ev. Lucae*, p. 140, favor the reading of D.

ally, as if they were the well-known and commonly-used designations, concerning which there was no question. And twice Origen seems to indicate that both names stood in the gospel account which he read. So ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν δὲ εὐαγγελίῳ (Contra Celsum ii: 62) and γέγραπται δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν (Contra Celsum ii: 68).[1] Origen must have read a Greek text that indicated Simon as the disciple unnamed in our text. Whether his text authority was simply that of λέγοντες instead of λέγοντας we cannot certainly tell. He does not indicate what Simon he has in mind, though it is most probable that it is Simon Peter.[2] If so, he must have found his authority in the ὤφθη Σίμωνι of vs. 34, the only occurrence of the name in this context. Un-

[1] For all the references and complete discussion *cf.* Alfred Resch: Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Lukas (*Texte u. Unters.*, vol. x. Part 2), 1895, pp. 770–782, and Agrapha (*T. u. U.*, vol. v., part 4), 1889, pp. 423 f. *Cf.* also M. E. Bengel: *Gnomon N. T.*, 3d. ed., 1855, p. 297, note 1 (*ad* Luke xxiv: 18).

[2] Arnold Meyer, p. 135, identifying the names Cleopas and Clopas, suggests that Origen means Simon (Simeon) son of Clopas who later became "bishop" of Jerusalem, as recounted by Hegesippus in Euseb., *Ch. Hist.*, iii., 32: 6, iv., 22: 4. On him *cf.* Zahn: *Forschungen*, part vi., pp. 235–243. For other suggestions (Nathanael, Luke) *cf.* the same work, pp. 350 f. Zahn (p. 352) is for Simon of Jerusalem, with A. Meyer. Arthur Carr, in *Expositor*, 6th Series, vol. ix. (Feb., 1904), pp. 121 ff., argues for Luke. H. Zimmermann, *St. K.*, vol. lxxiv. (1901), p. 444, note 2, suggests James; Volkmar, pp. 623 f., thinks Paul is intended. Völter, in *Prot. Monatshefte*, vol. xv. (1911), *Heft* 2, pp. 61–65, argues that historically Simon Peter and Clopas saw Jesus as they sat at supper at Emmaus in Galilee; Luke deliberately removed the scene to Judea, erased Peter's name, and changed Clopas to the Greek form Cleopas. A. B. Grosart, in *Expositor*, series 4, vol. iv., p. 109, asks if Cleopas's companion might possibly be his ***wife.***

less quoting, Origen would naturally have used the name Peter.[1] No other church father betrays a knowledge of this tradition, but Codex S (No. 354 in the Vatican Library, written in 949) has as a marginal note on Luke xxiv: 18, ὅτι ὁ μετὰ τοῦ Κλεωπᾶ πορευόμενος Σίμων ἦν οὐχ ὁ Πέτρος ἀλλ' ὁ ἕτερος. This is perhaps due to a knowledge of Origen.[2] In any case, the agreement of Origen with the peculiar reading of Codex D in this one point and nowhere else would form a puzzle, as Zahn urges, and Origen is so familiar with other texts and MSS. that his acceptance of the peculiar reading would be hard to explain. Probably some extra-canonical tradition, perhaps due originally to an ambiguous Syriac rendering, gave rise both to the Bezan reading and to Origen's statements. Certain old-Latin codices give in vs. 13 the names of the two disciples as Cleopas and Ammaus, the latter being evidently a mis-reading of the word Emmaus as the name of a person instead of that of a place.[3] Ambrosius thrice gives the names as Ammaon (once Amaon) and Cleophas.[4] This Ammaon may be derived from the Ammaus of the old-Latin MSS. (so Resch),

[1] As he does, *e.g.*, in Cont. Cels. i.: 62, 63; ii.: 1, 2, 15, 34, 39, 45, 64, etc. In ii.: 65 it is Κηφᾶς ὁ Πέτρος, where he is quoting Paul's list in I. Cor. 15, and explains Paul's name Κηφᾶς by his own ὁ Πέτρος. So in ii.: 1 ἐπὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Πέτρον is quoted from Acts x: 5.

[2] Zahn, *loc. cit.*, seems to contradict himself, saying on p. 352 "unabhängig von Origenes," with a reference to a note on p. 350 which says "wohl aus Origenes." *Cf.* Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on Luke, ad loc.*

[3] References in Resch, *loc. cit.*, pp. 769 f., Zahn, p. 351.

[4] References in Resch, p. 777, Zahn, p. 351.

or, less probably, corrupted from the Σίμων of Origen (so Zahn and Rohrbach).[1]

There does not, then, seem sufficient textual evidence for putting the words ὄντως ἠγέρθη κ.τ.λ. into the mouth of the Two rather than that of the Eleven, or for making Peter one of the Two. Luke's context clearly reckons him to the Eleven, otherwise there were no eleven, but only ten. "The Twelve" might have stood here as a technical designation of the group, irrespective of the presence or absence of every member, but never "the Eleven." Resch complains that the Greek construction εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς λέγοντας is "unerträglich hart," and it is indeed awkward. But would ὑπέστρεψαν . . . καὶ εὗρον . . . λέγοντες be less so? And can we imagine the *two* disciples saying, "He appeared to *Simon*," instead of "He appeared to *us*"?[2] As a matter of fact, ὤφθη is not at all the word they would have used, or Luke would have used, to describe the recent intercourse of Jesus with them. He did not "appear," which word has a connotation of suddenness and brevity, but came up behind them as they walked, became the companion of their journey, held long discourse with them, went into their house, and joined them in their evening meal.

No, ὤφθη Σίμωνι is a bit of the primitive tradition of

[1] Zahn, p. 351 (*cf.* part iv., p. 313); Rohrbach: Schluss, p. 60. Almost as easily could the Σίμωνι of vs. 34 be corrupted from an original ἡμῖν!

[2] Resch, p. 780, thinks both said *ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος*, and then Cleopas, remembering Peter's need and the angel's word *καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ* (which, however, Luke expunges!) added *καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι*.

"appearances" of the Master in glory. The abruptness and brevity of its mention here have always been a matter of criticism for the commentators. Though this is the first and most important appearance, it gets but the scantest notice, as a second-hand report, with no word of description, no detail of time or place or circumstance. The explanation is not far to seek. The only appearance to disciples of which tradition has given Luke any *description* is that to the Eleven. The first intercourse with the risen Master which he describes, the one which he gives at greatest length, with greatest care, with most evidence of personal interest, is that enjoyed by the Emmaus disciples, outside the circle of the Twelve. Yet the tradition gave him the bare fact that the first appearance came to Peter. Peter, too, is one of Luke's heroes; he, as well as Paul and the others, helps to carry the gospel out of Judaism into the world. Luke has no interest whatever in suppressing the appearance to Peter, but he knows nothing to say about it; he can preserve its chronological priority only by having the Eleven announce it to the Two, before the latter make their report. If we ask when, where, under what circumstances the appearance came to Peter, Luke knows no more than do we. He had to insert the statement at this point, and had absolutely no details; naturally enough the Greek is not entirely smooth.

It is clearly impossible that Luke is meaning, from vs. 13 on, to describe the appearance to Peter of which a tradition he cannot ignore assures him, and yet alludes to Peter's presence only in the δύο of vs. 13 and the plural numbers, Peter's companion being named and alone speaking. Verse 35 also makes absolutely

clear that the ὄντως ἠγέρθη κ.τ.λ. is the glad cry with which the Two are greeted, not an awkward anticipation of the αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ κ.τ.λ. On the contrary assumption, the αὐτοί would have no force and ought to be deleted; indeed, the whole context would demand alteration. Natural as it is to suppose that Luke must have related at some length the appearance to the pillar-apostle, Simon Peter, he does not do so, and that simply because he cannot. Verse 34 indicates not only the measure of his immediate personal concern in Peter and the "outside disciples," respectively, but also the measure of his knowledge of the experiences which gave them, respectively, their call and consecration to the apostolic ministry. Of Peter he repeats two traditional words; of the others he writes twenty-three verses.

Finally, there may be brief mention of another solution of the difficulty of vs. 34. Merx argues, on the basis of the Sinaitic Syriac text, that vss. 34 to 36 are interpolated, the original text reading " . . . found the Eleven gathered together and them that were with them, and he appeared, and they were terrified and affrighted," etc. This exceedingly awkward and abrupt reading, omitting all report to the Eleven by the Two, is quite impossible as the original. The view was suggested by a scribal error by which "and he appeared" is inadvertently inserted between "with them" and "saying" (vs. 33), thus forming a duplicate to the entrance of Jesus in vs. 36.[1] The Curetonian text is the equivalent of our Greek.

[1] Merx, *ad loc.* (pp. 520–523, 533–535). On the scribal error *cf.* F. C. Burkitt: *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, 1904, vol. i., notes *ad*

So ends the Emmaus episode. It is not a record of historical happenings; it is Luke's construction.[1] But what it expresses is historical fact, namely, that others besides the Twelve had visions of the risen Jesus, that the Christian movement which eventuated in the world-church of the second century did not go out altogether, or chiefly, from the twelve disciples. Acts makes that important fact clear; but we commonly do not date sufficiently early the participation of this larger group in the work. We vaguely think of it as beginning with Paul's conversion, some five years after Jesus' death. That is largely due to Luke's own presentation, in the earlier chapters of Acts, for Luke, though he is very certain of the fact, lacks definite data for its demonstration. We must carry back this wider sphere of apostolic activity into the time immediately after Jesus' death, as Luke correctly, if vaguely, does. The matter needs more attention than it has had, and would repay careful study. Might we not hope, for example, for some light on the foundation of the church at Rome, and some explanation of the fact that this church needs, in the year 59, a de-

---

Luke xxiv: 33 and ix: 12. Lake (pp. 101–103), finding it incredible "that St. Luke, probably the most literary of the evangelists, would have left this disconnected reference to an event which is not described in the gospel," resolves to have the unnecessary "courage of despair, and think that St. Luke himself did not write" the words *καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι*.

[1] On the origin and meaning of the Emmaus story, *cf.* Brandt, pp. 362–365; Pfleiderer, p. 468; Schmiedel, col. 4075; Arnold Meyer, pp. 131–136; Lake, pp. 218 f. Brandt here shows the worst excesses of the Tübingen method. Arnold Meyer and Lake posit some real experience of disciples near Jerusalem, related later to the Galilean disciples.

tailed justification of the freedom of Christianity from Judaism?

At any rate, we are not without more definitely historical data than Luke offers. Paul's allusion to "Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, *who are of note among the apostles, who also have been in Christ before me*" (Rom. xvi: 7), *e. g.*, may give food for thought. Here are two men, distinguished (ἐπισήμοι) among the company of apostles, who are absolutely unknown except for this casual allusion, and yet whose Christian life and activity began prior to Paul's.[1] How many other such must there not have been! The list of names in Romans xvi. suggests many questions; what, *e. g.*, of those four other kinsmen of Paul, Herodion and Lucius and Jason and Sosipater? One cannot help being reminded at this point of another definite statement of Paul's, "then he appeared to all the apostles."

Paul cites the appearances to Peter and to the Twelve from the primitive κήρυγμα, and then adds appearances to many outside this traditional group,

[1] Riggenbach, p. 9, suggests that these two men may have been among the Five Hundred. So already M. E. Bengel: *Gnomon N. T.*, 3d ed., 1855, p. 662. Origen (*Comm. in Rom.*, book x., 21) places them among the Seventy. The latter group included also, says Eusebius (*Ch. Hist.*, i., 12: 1–3), Barnabas, Sosthenes (I. Cor. i: 1), Matthias and Joseph Barsabbas (Acts i: 23), and Thaddeus, whom Mark (iii: 18) places among the Twelve. All these men, save Sosthenes, are ranked in the N. T. as apostles, and therefore as recipients of visions of the risen Master. Nor is there any reason to deny the apostolic name to Sosthenes, though Paul calls him only a "brother"; he is certainly not merely the amanuensis. *Cf.* Van Manen, art. "Sosthenes" in *Encyc. Biblica*, vol. iv.

appearances which lie entirely outside the gospel accounts, except that of Luke. So to five hundred men at one time, and this very early, succeeding the appearance to the Twelve, and preceding that to James. What must not these five hundred and more men have done for the spread of the new faith![1] James sees his glorified brother and becomes an apostle, then, in turn, all the apostles are called by the heavenly vision to their work. These do not include "the Twelve" but are a distinct and multifold larger number. The list really begins with James, and ends with Paul himself, both of whom are apostles, but only as are Junias and Andronicus and all the rest. After Peter and the Twelve and the Five Hundred have seen the Master, in other words,—and that means very shortly after Jesus' death—begins a series of "appearances" to a great number of men, beginning with James, a series that was not entirely complete when Paul was writing. To James, to all the apostles, to me.

The ἐφάπαξ significantly fails with τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν, and must not be supplied in thought, as is commonly done. Rather, "as often as a man was called to missionary service, it was done by means of a Christophany."[2] Only so could one be an apostle, "numbered with the Eleven apostles" which means to "become a witness with us of the resurrection" (Acts i: 22). The apostolic call is almost synonymous with a seeing of the Master; "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (I. Cor. ix: 1). Each of the

[1] W. Seufert: *Ursprung und Bedeutung des Apostolates*, 1887, p. 46, well points out that in Paul's sense, and the real sense, the 500 are "apostles."

[2] Von Dobschütz, p. 35.

long list of apostles must make the same claim. "Then to all the apostles," says Paul. Luke simply gives us, in the Emmaus story, the beginning and the typical expression of this greater and more prolonged revelation. Origen correctly understands the relation of Luke's presentation to Paul's brief list, when he cites thus the substance of Paul's words: "And subsequently he appeared to all the other apostles besides [παρά, "alongside"] the Twelve, *perhaps to the Seventy*" (Contra Celsum, ii., 65).[1]

[1] Portions of the discussion of this chapter were published by the present writer in *The Biblical World*, April, 1910, "The Emmaus Disciples and the Purposes of Luke."

CHAPTER XI

THEN TO THE TWELVE

WE continue Luke's narrative from xxiv: 35. "And they [αὐτοί emphatic] were relating the things on the road and how he was made known to them in the breaking of the bread. And as they were saying these things, he himself stood [ἔστη aorist, came and stood, appeared standing] in their midst." This is the "appearance" of Jesus "to the Twelve" promised by the angel (Mk. xvi: 7), chronicled by Matthew (xxviii: 17 ff.), and attested as a fixed part of the Christian preaching by Paul (I. Cor. xv: 5). To be sure, in Luke's account, it comes not to "the Twelve" alone, but to "them that were with them" as well, including Cleopas and his companion. With Peter, the company thus includes three men who have already seen the risen Master, and the entire group already believes in his resurrection. The ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος is the expression of their common conviction.

All the more astonishing, therefore, is the statement of the following verse,[1] "And being terrified and frightened they were thinking to behold a spirit." πνεῦμα is replaced by φάντασμα in Codex Bezae, thus correctly

[1] Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν is lacking in the Western text, and is omitted by Tischendorf and B. Weiss (double-bracketed by W.-H.) as an interpolation from John xx: 19.

rendering Luke's meaning of "ghost." How is it possible that a group of men, all of whom believe Jesus risen, three of whom have seen him within a few hours, can, upon his appearance, be terrified and believe that what they see is but a phantom? That they really did not believe that it was he in person is made perfectly clear by Jesus' words of rebuke and the "still disbelieved" of vs. 41. The situation seems an impossible one.[1] It looks as if xxiv: 36 ff. were originally meant to chronicle a first appearance, and ought to follow immediately after vs. 11. This arrangement would precisely parallel that of Matthew, and would relieve all appearance of contradiction. That such was the original arrangement has been well argued by Brandt, and is regarded as probable by many.[2] Brandt supposes the narrative to have been originally completed without vss. 13–35, which Luke later inserted, in his desire to present the appearance to "outside" disciples. The text would favour this view, and the following degree of truth, at any rate, there is in it. The Emmaus episode is an entirely separate element, without points of connection with the rest of the account. It comes out whole without disturbing the context; it has a specific point which it makes very clearly, and it is Luke's own construction. Being so separate from the rest, it does indeed not fit smoothly into its place. The older tradition of an appearance to the Twelve as the first (aside from the half-forgotten one to Peter) cannot easily be adjusted to the Emmaus story. There is awkwardness and contradiction.

[1] So, *e.g.*, Beyschlag, p. 440.

[2] Brandt, p. 376. So also B. W. Bacon, *Expositor*, March, 1909, p. 255.

But Luke's apologetic motive and purpose explain it. The disciples' doubt and slowness to believe are so important to his construction that the adjustment to the preceding is not attempted.[1]

This doubt-*motif* we must here follow a little farther. Its genesis we have already considered,[2] and have observed that it always occurs in conjunction with the "Jerusalem tradition" and the insistence on the physical definition of the resurrection. This connection shows it to be a late element in the tradition, as, on other grounds also, it is clearly seen to be. There was no doubt, or failure to believe, on the part of those to whom came the original "appearances" of Jesus.[3] Even in the case of Paul, to whom the appearance came as to an enemy and a stranger, with every prepossession against its validity, conviction was immediate. So it was in the case of all the others; so it was with Peter. *The Lord himself appeared;* where is there room for doubt, for argument, for laboured proof? The spiritual manifestation comes with heavenly and compelling power to the spirit, and carries immediate and unshakable conviction. Only when it becomes important, even necessary, for the apologetic that the disciples should *not* at first believe, is violence done to historic and psychological verity, and a strange veil thrown over their understandings. Luke's insight is correct; the thing is unnatural. The truth, however plainly spoken, is supernaturally concealed from them, their eyes are holden, their hearts

[1] Merx, *loc. cit.*, pp. 533 f., meets the difficulty by his excision of vss. 34–36.

[2] *Cf. supra*, pp. 280–282.

[3] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 206 f.

made dull. A spiritual vision is in all ages its own attestation to the spirit to which it comes; but for the renewal of life and activity in a body once dead and buried there must needs be physical evidence. How strange to Peter and Paul would be the statement (Acts i: 3) that to his apostles Jesus "presented himself as living after his passion *by many sure proofs*" (τεκμηρίοις), or the utterance ascribed to Peter himself (Acts x: 40) that the Master manifested himself, "not to all the people, but unto witnesses selected beforehand by God, namely *us, who ate together and drank together with him after he rose from the dead*"! That is the kind of evidence that is important for Luke, so important that it is allowed to create in his narrative contradictory situations, which he is powerless to set right. A strong statement demands strong proofs; strong proofs are for the overcoming of strong doubts; strong doubts arise over strong statements; so runs the circle of apology. Very prominent in Luke, in the Fourth Gospel this doubt of the disciples is limited to one typical instance; Thomas doubts for them all (xx: 24–29), the others are glad when they see the Lord. The "holden" eyes of the Emmaus disciples have their analogue in the failure of Mary Magdalene to recognise Jesus, supposing him to be the gardener (xx: 14–16), and in the disciples' similar lack of recognition when they see him on the shore of the lake (xxi: 4 ff.).[1] We have already seen how this

[1] Like most apologetic arguments, this consideration raises a difficulty worse than the one it would relieve. If Jesus' friends, who had parted from him on the Friday, found him so changed on the Sunday that they did not recognise him, "how could they know, or how can we know, that the person assumed to be Jesus

motif introduced a disturbing and irrational phrase into Matt. xxviii: 17.[1] More strongly does it exhibit its power in the passage given by the *Textus Receptus* to complete the mutilated last chapter of Mark (xvi: 9–20).

At this passage we must look somewhat more closely. It is a homily on the disciples' disbelief, pure and simple; that is its text and its one theme.[2] It reproduces elements from the narratives of Luke and John, precisely those elements in precisely those gospels which develop the doubt-motive, but it carries this motive to a far greater extreme. The disciples disbelieved the report of Mary Magdalene, they disbelieved the report of the Emmaus disciples (to whom Jesus had appeared "in another form"), and when the Master comes to them "he upbraids them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." His instructions as to their future apostolic work are in substance only the condemnation of those who fail to believe, the blessing of those who believe. Into the detailed criticism of this extra-canonical fragment we cannot here enter. Manuscript evidence long ago made certain what a mere reading of the passage is enough to demonstrate, that it is no part of the original text of Mark.[3] An Armenian codex written in the

was actually their risen Lord?" W. R. Greg, *The Creed of Christendom*, 5th ed., 1877, Introduction, p. xxxii.

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 279–282 f.

[2] *Cf.* Volkmar, p. 639; Latham, pp. 202 f.

[3] All that can be said for its originality may be found in John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 1871; George Salmon, *Introduction to the N. T.*, 6th ed., 1892, pp. 144–151; J. P. Van Kasteren, in *Revue Biblique Internationale*, vol. xi. (1902),

year 986, discovered by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in 1890, attributes this passage to "Ariston the presbyter," by which name is in all probability meant the Aristion mentioned by Papias (in Eusebius' *Church History*, iii., 39) as one of his sources of information concerning the mission of Jesus.[1] This identification is now commonly adopted, and nothing can be urged against it.

Much discussion has been given to Jerome's quotation of a passage after vs. 14, which none of our MSS. have hitherto offered. It reads as follows: "Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis sub Satana est, qui non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem. Idcirco iam nunc revela iustitiam tuam."[2] Jerome seems to

---

pp. 240–255. *Cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, vol. ii., pp. 237 f., and *Geschichte des Kanons*, vol. ii., pp. 910 ff. The latter discussion of Zahn is the completest yet published, and leaves little to be said. Other valuable treatments are found in Tischendorf and W.-H.; in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, article "Gospel of Mark," by S. D. F. Salmond; in Resch, *Paralleltexte*, part i., 1893 (*T. u. U.*, vol. x., part i.), pp. 449–456; Schmiedel, cols. 4050 and 4053; Arnold Meyer, pp. 59–64; and the commentaries of Meyer-Weiss, Gould *et al.*

[1] Conybeare published his discovery in the *Expositor*, Oct., 1893 (4th Series, vol. viii.), pp. 241–254, with a further article in the same journal, Dec., 1895 (5th Series, vol. ii.), pp. 401–421. *Cf.* Zahn in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1893, No. 51; Harnack, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1893, No. 23; Rohrbach: Schluss, pp. 1–23. Resch, *loc. cit.*, argues for authorship by Ariston of Pella, suggested earlier by Prof. Sanday (Conybeare, 1893, p. 243); *cf.* Schmiedel, cols. 4053 f. The date of Aristion's writing probably falls in the latter part of the first half of the second century. F. H. Chase, *The Syriac Element in Codex Bezae*, 1893, pp. 150–157, argues for a somewhat earlier date.

[2] Jerome, Contra Pelagianos, ii., 15, in Migne, vol. xxiii., cols. 550 f.

feel it quite possible that his opponent may question the authority of this citation ("cui si contradicitis") clearly because it belongs to that doubtful last section of Mark. On another occasion he repeats what Eusebius had written about this section, that it "in raris fertur evangeliis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, praesertim cum diversa atque contraria Evangelistis caeteris narrare videatur."[1] But here he is concerned to make the most of all the evidence he can find to support his contention, and therefore describes the passage as being "in quibusdam exemplaribus, et maxime in Græcis codicibus." That this statement refers to the whole "false conclusion" (vss. 9–20) of Mark, and not merely to the words which his quotation has in excess of our common text,[2] is clear from the fact that he begins his citation with vs. 14 of our common text. Jerome really knew very few MSS. with the "false conclusion," and certain of these had the text in its longer form.

Strangely enough, until very recently there has been no other trace of this longer text, but we now have a single Greek manuscript which gives Jerome's reading, a manuscript which conceivably lay before Jerome, though it is more probably later.[3] This is the already famous Freer manuscript, bought by Mr. Charles L. Freer of Detroit from a dealer in Cairo in 1907, and now

[1] Epistola cxx., ad Hedibiam, ch. v. (*apud* Migne, vol. xxii., col. 987), quoted from Eusebius, *Quaestiones ad Marinum*. *Cf.* Burgon, *loc. cit.*, pp. 42–45, 53; W.-H., *Notes*, p. 33.

[2] So it is commonly understood; *cf.* C. R. Gregory, *Das Freer Logion*, 1908, p. 27.

[3] Grenfell dates it not later than the 5th century, perhaps in the 4th. Sanders and Goodspeed think the 5th or 6th. Gregory, *loc. cit.*, p. 19.

in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.[1] The MS. contains the four gospels in Greek, and the text of Mark xvi. gives not only vss. 9–20, but between vss. 14 and 15 the passage cited by Jerome with its continuation in a reply of Jesus to the disciples' excusing of themselves, in all eighty-eight words. There are errors of orthography in the text and some slight emendations are necessary, but in general the reading is clear and agrees with Jerome's citation. A literal translation is as follows. "And they excused themselves, saying: This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who does not allow the things that are unclean by the spirits to apprehend the true power of God. Therefore reveal thy righteousness now, they were saying to Messiah. And Messiah said unto them: The limit of the years of the authority of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near. And for them who sinned I was delivered unto death, that they might return to the truth and might no longer sin, that they might inherit the glory of righteousness, spiritual and incorruptible in the heaven. But going into all the world . . ." etc. There is perhaps no *a priori* reason why this passage may not have been written by Aristion; until we have a critical edition of the entire Freer gospel text we shall not be in a position to judge. But at present it seems wiser, with Gregory, to regard it as a gloss.[2] There would seem to be no

[1] Of the large and growing literature on this MS. the completest treatment is C. R. Gregory, *Das Freer Logion*, Leipzig, 1908.

[2] *Cf.* H. Koch, "Der Erweiterte Markusschluss und die Kleinasiatischen Presbyter," in *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 1908 (vol. vi.), pp. 266–278. E. J. Goodspeed, in *Biblical World*, 1908 (p. 224), calls the passage a gloss from an apocryphal gospel or second-century oral tradition.

reason why it should be expunged from all versions and from all Greek MSS. except one or two, so far as we know. And the text of vs. 15 has to be altered by the omission of καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς and the substitution of ἀλλά, to permit the insertion. The style and thought are hardly consonant with those of Aristion's context, though this argument cannot be pressed. It is on the whole more probable that an excuse for the disciples' unbelief would be added than that it should be expunged, especially since the entire section is concerned to emphasise this unbelief so strongly. Still, we must for the present leave open the possibility that the passage is a genuine part of Aristion's homily.[1]

In any case the Aristion passage is only part of a context originally more extended, as its abrupt beginning shows, and what it may or may not once have contained we cannot now tell. What it is concerned with, whether or no the Freer addition belongs to it, is very plain. From Luke and from John the statement of the disciples' doubt and disbelief has been taken and given exaggerated emphasis. And the disbelief is confined to the Eleven; nothing of Mary Magdalene's initial hesitancy in recognising Jesus, nothing of the "slowness of heart" of the Emmaus disciples. Nothing of the larger company present to share their

[1] Knowing only the Jerome citation, Schmiedel, col. 4053, regards it as a gloss, but Rohrbach: Schluss, pp. 21 f., argues for its genuineness, as does J. B. Van Kasteren, in *Revue Biblique Internationale*, vol. xi. (1902), pp. 250–253. Von Soden (*Christliche Welt*, 1908, cols. 484–486) and Harnack (*Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1908, cols. 168–170), discussing the Freer MS., regard the addition as belonging to the original document of Aristion, but never to the Mark-ending drawn from that document. This is the most probable conjecture.

incredulity and their rebuke "because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen"; these latter, who saw, plainly did believe. Salvation is conditioned on belief, damnation on unbelief. Signs are promised to "follow them that believe" (vs. 17), which promise is fulfilled by the event (vs. 20). In all this is seen the verification of the words of Arnold Meyer, "It was a later time, no longer standing in the first faith, but itself attacked by doubts, which first spoke of doubts on the part of the disciples."[1]

The next step in the growing emphasis on the disciples' doubt and disbelief is offered by a Coptic gospel-fragment found in a MS. of the fourth or fifth century, discovered at Akhmim in Egypt.[2] Harnack dates the writing of which this MS. preserves a part between 150 and 180 A.D., that is, not many years after Aristion writes. If the latter offers a homily on unbelief, what shall we say of his successor? The apologetic need of the time stands out very clearly. The most significant portion of the fragment runs as follows. "Mary, Martha and Mary Magdalene go to the grave to anoint the body. When they find the grave empty they are troubled, and weep. The Lord appears to them and says: Why do ye weep? Cease to weep; I am he whom

[1] Arnold Meyer, p. 201. On the general point, *cf.* pp. 197–202, 206 f.; also the valuable discussion by F. H. Foster, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, vol. xii. (July, 1908), pp. 386–391.

[2] First published by Carl Schmidt in *Sitzungsberichte d. Königlichen Preussischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, 1895, pp. 705–711. Valuable treatment by Harnack, "Ein jüngst entdeckter Auferstehungsbericht," in *Theologische Studien B. Weiss Dargebracht*, 1897, pp. 1–8. *Cf.* also Schmiedel, col. 4048; Hennecke, *Apok.*, pp. 38 f.; Arnold Meyer, pp. 81–84, and for further trace of the same work, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, Oct., 1910, pp. 55 f.

ye seek. But let one of you go to your brethren and say: Come, the Master is risen from the dead. Martha came and told it to us. We said to her: What have we to do with thee, woman? He who died is buried and it is impossible that he should be alive. We did not believe her that the Redeemer had risen from the dead. Then she returned to the Lord and said to him: No one among them has believed me that thou art alive. He said: Let another of you go to them and tell it them once again. Mary went and repeated it to us again, and we did not believe her. She returned to the Lord and she also told him. Then the Lord said to Mary and her other sisters: Let us go to them. And he came and found us within and called us out. But we thought that it was a spectre, and did not believe that it was the Lord. Then he said to us: Come and . . . thou, Peter, who thrice hast denied, dost thou now also deny? We went up to him, doubting in our hearts that it might not be he. Then he said to us: Why do ye still doubt and are unbelieving? I am he who spake to you of my flesh and my death and my resurrection, that ye may believe that it is I. Peter, put your finger into the nail-prints of my hands. Thou, Thomas, put thy finger into the lance-thrust of my side. And thou, Andrew, touch my feet, so thou seest that they . . . to those of earth. For it is written in the prophet, Fancies of dreams . . . on earth. We answered him: We have in truth recognised that . . . in flesh. And we threw ourselves upon our faces, and confessed our sins, that we have been unbelieving."[1]

[1] English rendering of the German version given by Harnack and repeated by Hennecke and Arnold Meyer.

Comment on this text is unnecessary. It only writes large what the scribe who added οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν in Mat. xxviii: 17 wrote small. In both cases, in all cases, the disciples' doubt is apologetic and unhistoric. "The first group of heroes was no band of doubters, 'double-minded men, unstable in all their ways.' Such men would never have 'received anything of the Lord,' least of all the resurrection-faith."[1] Without antecedent faith, the blessed vision would never have come; unless met by faith, it would never have come again.

We must now return to the appearance of Jesus to the Eleven, our consideration of which was interrupted by our excursus concerning the doubt-*motif*.[2] The verses which follow Luke xxiv: 37 are the further development of this same motive, the statement, made as bald and absolute as possible, of the actual physical bodily presence. The rebuke of the disciples, the exhibition of members of "flesh and bone," the evidential eating, are all here. Here is the supremest antithesis to all that Paul meant by Jesus' resurrection[3]; here is every shred of historicity lost in the urgency of the apologetic need. It is a curious turn of history that has made the passage which had most worth for the apologists of the first and second centuries most embarrassing and unusable for those of the nineteenth and twentieth. Most instructive and interesting is a study of the treatment of vss. 39 and 43 in the English commentaries and treatises. How vastly easier would be the task of the modern defender of the faith if his colleague of eighteen hundred years ago had not resorted to such powerful weapons, which have now

[1] Arnold Meyer, p. 201. [2] *Supra*, p. 335. [3] *Cf.* I. Cor. vi: 13!

ceased to be weapons of defence and have become, instead, part of the store to be defended.[1]

All modern theories of a body glorified or in process of glorification, or in any way other than the physical body which had been buried, contradict Luke's urgent intention here as completely as does the vision-theory itself. "Why are ye alarmed, and why do doubts arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. Take hold of me and see, because a spirit has not flesh and bones as you observe me having." The "flesh and bones," instead of the more familiar "flesh and blood," serves to give crasser expression to the materiality of the body. Luke intends us to understand that the disciples actually did grasp Jesus' limbs and body, and felt the massive resistance of flesh and bones (καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα). The statement of vs. 40, "And having said this, he showed them his hands and his feet," is awkward in sense (they must *feel*, not be *shown*), unnecessary, and on the evidence of the MSS. is an interpolation, evidently based on John xx: 20.[2]

There is an interesting variant of vs. 39 in Ignatius's epistle to the Smyrnæans, chapter three. "When He came to Peter and his company, He said to them, Lay hold and handle me, and see that I am not a demon without body. And straightway they touched Him

[1] This change of attitude is very clearly seen, for example, in Milligan, pp. 240 f., notes 4 and 6.

[2] Omitted in the Western text and the Syriac (both Sin. and Cur. Plummer, p. 569, *ad loc.*, is in error as to the Syr. Sin. *Cf.* Burkitt, *Evangelion Da Mepharreshe*, 1904, vol. i., *ad loc.*). Omitted by Tischendorf and Weiss, double-bracketed by W.-H. Merx, *ad loc.*, argues that, though not in Syr. Sin., it is original.

and they believed."[1] Jerome says this text was taken by Ignatius from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which it is difficult to feel certain, since Origen ascribes the words to the *Petri Doctrina*, and Eusebius says he is quite ignorant of Ignatius's source for them, although both knew the Gospel of the Hebrews.[2]

"And as they still disbelieved from joy and wondered, he said to them: Have you here something to eat? And they gave to him a piece of broiled fish, and taking it, he ate it before their eyes (ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν)." The eating is, of course, purely evidential, and it evidences a body with teeth to chew, a throat to swallow, a stomach to retain; in other words, a normal physical body. Luke means this in the completest sense, that the processes of eating and digestion went on precisely as before. The disciples' senses might be deceived, but the mastication, swallowing, and retention of food are conclusive.

This whole scene, vss. 37–43, is Luke's creation; not his conscious invention, for he is of course certain that he is setting forth the truth. Tradition, growing to meet the needs of controversy, supplies the data to which he here gives orderly narrative form. What he really set out to describe was the appearance of Jesus to the Eleven, the parallel to Mat. xxviii: 17–20. The tradition, as it came to him, did not definitely fix the scene of that appearance, though it was clear to Matthew that it belonged to Galilee. Beyond fixing the occurrence in Jerusalem, Luke does not define the place

[1] Translation by Bishop Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., 2d ed., vol. ii., 1889, pp. 567 f.

[2] Jerome, *De Viris Illust.*, ch. xvi. *Cf.* Lightfoot's note, *loc. cit.*, pp. 294–296.

more closely, but since the Eleven are gathered together in a place where it is possible to secure a piece of cooked fish, he probably thinks of the scene as indoors, perhaps at the disciples' place of lodging.[1] Matthew, for excellent reasons, locates the scene upon a mountain, and the same reasons operate in the case of Luke. For at the end of the scene Jesus leads the disciples out "over against Bethany," *i.e.*, to the Mount of Olives. For Luke, as for Matthew, the Master needs the mount from which to take his flight to heaven; it is only an unimportant difference in detail that in Matthew the disciples gather on the mountain prior to the "appearance," and the whole scene takes place there, while in Luke the meeting and the appearance are in the city, and the company walks out to the mountain for the closing scene.

There are four problems to be considered in connection with Luke's account of this appearance to the Eleven; first, its content; second, its place; third, its time; fourth, the parting of Jesus. First, then, as to its content. It is in substance the same content as that presented by Matthew—full revelation of the risen Jesus as the glorified Messiah and fulfilment of the prophecies, the apostolic commission to preach him as such to the world, an assurance of his abiding presence. As a matter of literal fact, this was precisely what the "appearance" had meant and had involved for the disciples; the story of the growing church had verified that, and it was hardly possible for either Matthew or Luke to represent it otherwise. But each presents it in his own way, independent, not only of the other, but of any common source. Indeed,

[1] So John xx: 19 understands Luke to mean.

neither has any written source, but constructs the scene for himself. Matthew gives the declaration that Messiah has been exalted to his supreme place of power, has entered upon his kingship; Luke, paralleling the scene on the way to Emmaus, emphasises the Messianic light thrown on Scripture. Both give the apostolic commission to evangelise the nations. The abiding presence is expressed with more intimacy in Matthew; in Luke it takes the form of the indwelling of the Spirit, which is, of course, true to the church's history during the preceding decades, and true to Paul's profoundest conviction. Both conceive the scene as a kind of apostolic ordination and a solemn farewell, and both think of it as followed by a "departure" of Jesus from earth to heaven.[1] This is not said by Matthew, but is in his thought; by Luke it is clearly said.

Now precisely the same construction appears again in Luke's history, in Acts i: 6–12. There we have Jesus and the disciples assembled at a place at first (vs. 6) undefined, but later (vs. 12) fixed as the Mount of Olives; there follow the promise of the Spirit's presence and the apostolic commission to all the world, and the scene closes with the Master's "taking up" in a cloud. The substance is the same; that the wording is so largely different simply indicates that the author has no written source, but offers independent composition. He does not consciously duplicate, but he has one form of thought, one mental picture, from the material of which he constructs two passages, one to describe an event of the third day, the other of the forty-third. The passage in

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 282 f.

Acts is more closely akin to the parallel in Mat. xxviii: 16–20 than is that in Luke's gospel, for reasons which will subsequently appear.[1]

It is worth while to note the parallels between Luke's two accounts. In the first place, the position "over against Bethany," where he parted from them (Luke xxiv: 50 f.) is plainly equivalent to "the mount called Olivet" where "he was taken up" (Acts i: 12, 9).[2] Any hesitancy on this point is set at rest by Luke himself, who in xix: 29 f. explains that when Jesus was on the Mount of Olives, he was "over against" Bethany. Plainly the road from Jericho to Jerusalem passed over the great hill, for after mounting the ass at a point on the mount over against Bethany he comes (xix: 37) to "the descent of the Mount of Olives." This point, where Jesus receives the plaudits of the multitude, is precisely the point Luke thinks of as the scene of his farewell to his disciples, on both occasions which he pictures. The specific note of place in xix: 37, in addition to that of vss. 29 f., is peculiar to Luke; the spot is noteworthy for him. Further, Acts i: 4–8, "he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father . . . ye shall be baptised with the Holy Spirit . . . ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you," has its parallel in Luke xxiv: 49, "I send forth the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with power from on high." The bidding (Acts i: 8), "Ye shall be my witnesses, both in Jerusalem and Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth," is only slightly different from Luke xxiv: 47 f., " . . . should be preached in his

[1] *Cf. infra*, pp. 361 f.

[2] So Bauer, p. 278.

name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things."

The framework, then, is the same; the place also is the same, the mountain. Reasons for placing the scene upon a mountain we have seen in discussing Matthew's parallel. Matthew thinks of the mountain in Galilee where the great Sermon was delivered; Luke necessarily thinks of a mountain near Jerusalem, which can only be the Mount of Olives. An interesting apocryphal parallel, which shows the influence of all three synoptic writers, as well as of Aristion, is found in the fourth-century "Acts of Pilate." There we read, "And Phinees a priest and Adas a teacher and Haggai a Levite came down from Galilee to Jerusalem, and said to the rulers of the synagogue and the priests and the Levites: We saw Jesus and his disciples sitting on the mountain called Mamilch; and he said to his disciples, Go into all the world, etc. (the words of Aristion, Mark xvi: 15–18, with slight variation). And while Jesus was speaking to his disciples, we saw him taken up to heaven."[1] This simply combines the "mountain-appearance" of Matthew with the apostolic commission in Aristion's form and the "ascension" of Luke. The combination of the three elements

[1] Ch. xiv., in the longer Greek recension. Translation by Alex. Walker, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. viii., 1886, p. 422. *Cf.* Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kanons*, vol. ii., p.937. The mountain appears in various MSS. as Malek, Mophek, Mambre, Mabrech.

Another apocryphal parallel is apparently offered by the Coptic gospel-fragment (perhaps of the late second century) edited by A. Jacoby, *Ein neues Evangelien-fragment*, 1900, and discussed by C. Schmidt in the *Göttinger Gelehrter Anzeiger*, 1900, No. 6, pp. 481–506. "On the mountain . . . he endued us with the power of our apostleship."

is nowhere so clearly expressed in canonical sources; Matthew, who has the mountain most clearly, has no direct allusion to the ascension, Luke's gospel obscures both mountain and ascension somewhat, Acts has the three more clearly together. So, as is especially clear from the repetition of the report in chapter xvi, the canonical Acts of the Apostles most influences the author of the *Acta Pilati*. But his account shows how the three canonical versions were understood, precisely as their authors meant them to be understood. Aristion witnesses to the same thing, save that in his version the mountain is not explicitly mentioned. But it is presupposed in his "was taken up into heaven"; no one thought, or could think, of Jesus' ascension taking place from a house, or a street, or a valley, or from any place except a mountain. Least of all could Aristion think otherwise, who is here using Luke's gospel narrative and is familiar with the Acts account. The mountain is in his mind as the setting of the scene, even if he does not put it into his words.[1]

It is interesting that the *Acta Pilati* version follows Matthew in locating the mountain-appearance and the ascension in Galilee.[2] A shorter Greek recension, evidently later, attempts to do honour to Luke, and to Paul as well, by making the words of the three men from Galilee read as follows. "Jesus, whom you crucified, we have *seen in Galilee* with his eleven disciples *upon the Mount of Olives*, teaching them and saying, Go into all the world and proclaim the good news; and

[1] Bauer, p. 278, takes Mark xvi: 19 to mean ascension from the upper room.

[2] It is possible that Tertullian (Apol. 21) means to assign the ascension to Galilee. *Cf. infra*, p. 437, and Bauer, p. 278.

whosoever will believe and be baptised shall be saved, but whosoever will not believe shall be condemned. And having thus spoken, he went up into heaven. And both we and many *others of the five hundred* besides were looking on."[1]

So much for the place of the appearance to the Eleven. So far as this appearance is related at all, it gives the revelation of Jesus as Messiah and the apostolic commission of the disciples, and it closes with an "ascension," for which reason the scene is conceived as taking place upon a mountain. Matthew thinks of a Galilean peak, Luke of the Mount of Olives, Aristion and the author of the Acts of Pilate simply recombine elements from the canonical writers. Luke uses the scene twice, once for an event of the resurrection day, once for an event forty days later. And this brings us to the third question, that of the time of the occurrence.

It is common to interpret Luke xxiv: 50 f. as describing the same scene as Acts i: 4–11, which at once raises a chronological problem. When Luke is read by itself, its language naturally suggests that all the events of the twenty-fourth chapter belong on the same day. Its language taken by itself cannot easily mean anything else, and if the first three verses of the book of Acts had not been written, it would never have been taken to mean anything else. But these verses were written, and by the same Luke, and therefore,

[1] *A. N. Fathers*, vol. viii., p. 432. Similarly, to make agreement with Luke, one MS. of the longer recension has the reading, after Jesus' words, *εἶτα εἴδομεν αὐτὸν μετελθόντα εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν καὶ ἀναληφθέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. *Cf.* Tischendorf: *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 2nd ed., 1876, p. 260, note *ad loc.*

however violent a procedure it may seem, we must insert a notice "Here elapses forty days" between Luke's verses 43 and 44, or 49 and 50.[1] The alternative is to assume that Luke altered his opinion as to the date, owing to new information received after the gospel was written and published.[2] The latter view is commonly adopted by the freer critics, the former is the favourite with the harmonists and apologists. Both are equally wrong, and both are in a measure right. It is true that Luke does not so completely contradict and correct himself as some of the critics suppose; it is also true that all the events of chapter xxiv he means to place on one day. There is an ascension at the end of the gospel, there is an ascension at the beginning of Acts; the two are described in similar terms, yet they are two separate occasions, forty days apart.

The place where Luke has confused and contradicted his chronology is elsewhere; it is in his insertion of the Emmaus story, which, if we reflect upon the account critically, makes the scenes which follow it impossible or at least improbable. When the Three reach Emmaus, the day has already declined and it is toward evening. Then follow the preparations for the meal, the breaking of the bread, the recognition, and the hasty return to Jerusalem. It is manifestly unfair to interpret πρὸς ἑσπέραν (not ὀψίαν) ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἤδη (*already*) ἡ ἡμέρα as meaning anything else than the time about sunset.[3] The meal is plainly the supper,

[1] So B. Weiss and Plummer, *ad loc.;* Orr, p. 193, and many.

[2] So, among others, Brandt, pp. 370–374; Wendt (Meyer–Wendt), *Apostelgeschichte*, 1899, *ad* Acts i: 1 ff.; Schmiedel, col. 4059; Lake, p. 114; Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 127–129.

[3] Lake, p. 109, suggests that it means "three hours before sun-

or evening meal, and is not eaten at three o'clock in the afternoon, nor can we easily allow less than two hours for the return from Emmaus to Jerusalem. In brief, we could not well place the ascension much before midnight. But surely Luke does not conceive this great event as occurring in the darkness of night! And this becomes the chief argument of those who separate vss. 50–53 by forty days from vss. 1–43. To this the reply is at hand. Luke certainly does not think of Jesus ascending in the darkness of midnight, but just as certainly he does not think of him ascending by broad daylight, in the sight of every passer-by on the frequented highway leading out to Bethany. Is this more congruous? Are we to suppose that Luke deliberately pictures Jesus walking through the streets of Jerusalem from the house where he met with his disciples, "leading them out" through the gate, a group of a dozen men, and one of them a notorious recently-executed criminal, and before all the world, on a public thoroughfare, ascending bodily into the sky? If we ask that his pictures be congruous and visualisable for us we shall get little satisfaction. *Luke is not visualising at all;* he does not ask, or think, whether it is light or dark; the hour by the clock is wholly irrelevant. He is expressing a great and important truth, and this reckoning of the hours from the Emmaus supper on, so natural for us, lies wholly outside his consciousness. The whole Emmaus incident will not, indeed, fit historically into the framework of the rest

---

set," and gets the disciples back to Jerusalem in forty minutes. At such speed the other events could not merely be finished "before nightfall," as he suggests, but all would be over by four P.M.

of the chapter, but we utterly misconceive Luke when we think of him as calculating the time of day and anxious for chronological verisimilitude. The lateness of the hour, therefore, is not the slightest argument against the continuity of events from the beginning to the end of chapter twenty-four.

Indeed that such continuity is in Luke's thought is clear from all his phraseology.[1] On the third day Jesus rose from the dead, revealed himself to his disciples, and ascended into heaven, the ascension being but the completion of the resurrection. To be sure, according to the Jewish reckoning, "the third day" has ended at sunset; it might just include the scene at Emmaus, but not the appearance to the Eleven nor the ascension. But it has just been pointed out that the Emmaus story has no real inner connection with the rest of the narrative, and without it no sunset is indicated. The reference to sunset there, indeed, has no chronological motive, but is conditioned by the allusion to the Eucharist, which demands an evening meal. After writing vs. 29, Luke did not keep reminding himself that it was now the fourth day for the Jews, and indeed, himself a Gentile, and not here bound to any written source (as he was in xxiii: 54), he may very easily be thinking in terms of the Roman day, beginning at midnight.

In all this the important point is that Luke does not think of the resurrection and the ascension as separated by more than a period of hours. They are for him, as they are in reality, parts of one process.[2] Re-

[1] *Cf.* Lake, pp. 108 f.

[2] *Cf.* the fine treatment of this point in Beyschlag, pp. 477–481. Also Paul Lobstein, "Der evangelische Heilsglaube an die Aufer-

surrection is the passage from Hades to Heaven. Conceived by Luke as involving the reanimation of the buried body, it is only natural that he should think of this body as lingering for a little before completing its "rising," to communicate with the disciples. In any case, the tradition assured him of such "appearances." But Jesus cannot long delay; on the same day he must "rise" in the full sense into his place of glory in heaven. Earth is, as it were, a halting-place midway in his ascension; the first stage is from Hades to earth (and Luke conceives earth as literally *above* Hades); the second from earth to heaven. The universe is a three-storied structure; the abode of God, to which Jesus goes, is "in the highest" (ἐν ὑψίστοις ii: 14, xix: 38). "Resurrection" is not for Jesus, any more than for men who "are accounted worthy to attain to the resurrection from the dead" (xx: 35), simply a return to the "second story," but rather the complete passage from the lowest to the highest. The "ascension," that is, follows immediately upon the resurrection as its completion. It belongs to the third day, standing at the beginning, not at the end, of the "forty days."

But Luke is very far from supposing that after the resurrection is complete and Jesus has "entered into his glory," he reveals himself no more, that henceforward his followers have only memories on which to feed their hopes. On the contrary he knows very well that the heavens were opened and Stephen saw the glorified Master standing at God's right hand (Acts vii: 56),

stehung J. C.," in *Zeitschrift für Theol. u. Kirche*, vol. ii. (1892), p. 363, and Cheyne, *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution*, 1904, pp. 114 f.

that to Saul, on the way to Damascus, came the vision and the call of the Messiah whose followers Saul was on his way to persecute. But more especially does he know, or think that he knows, that for a period of forty days after the resurrection there came frequently such revelations of the Master to his disciples. These revelations he conceives after the analogy of the appearances before the ascension, when the body tarried on earth to greet those who most loved the Lord. The appearances to Stephen or to Saul did not in the least lend themselves as models for these earlier appearances. What the disciples most of all needed from the risen Master was instruction, clear demonstration of his Messiahship, the adjustment of the Scripture prophecies to the event, express bidding as to the apostolic mission on which they were to enter—where, what, and how they were to preach. That is the obvious need, that is the thing that occurs at once to Luke, whose interest lies in the spread of the Christian movement. That was the content of Jesus' communication to the Emmaus disciples and to the Eleven, on the third day. Just that he must continue to give them for a longer period, coming down from heaven, abiding with them, conversing, teaching, explaining, in sweet companionship eating and drinking with them, as in the old days. Not mere "appearances" to convince that he is risen, but blessed visitations. After each such coming, there is of course a corresponding going; Jesus does not lodge in Jerusalem, spend the night there. He comes to them, and goes again into heaven. And the period of this instruction is naturally put at forty days, a number full of significance in the Jewish tradition. Forty days was the Law being given to Moses, and in

forty days was it given anew to the people through Ezra, according to the influential apocalypse we call "Fourth Ezra," after which period Ezra likewise ascended to heaven.[1]

That the "appearances" continued after the "ascension" we may be as sure as was Luke. A study of the biographies of the saints of the church will show us that they have never ceased.[2] That they were especially numerous in the first days is also most probable, but to Luke's precise number forty we need not feel in any degree bound. In any case, this is meant only as the period of most frequent manifestations, and of those in which Jesus actually came down and held protracted intercourse with his friends; "appearances" continued to be vouchsafed.

Now after each of his visits during those days, the glorified Master returned into heaven; that is, he "ascended." The ascension of Luke xxiv: 51 is the first ascension, the one which completes the resurrection and takes Jesus into his place of glory at God's right hand. It is the same as that understood after Mat. xxviii: 20. The ascension of Acts i: 9 is the last ascension; the last, that is, of this series of comings and goings. Of these the second is in its description necessarily the analogue of the first, for it is but a repetition of the same act; Luke has no other scheme for his de-

[1] *Cf.* Brandt, p. 372. The passage in our English Apocrypha is Second Esdras xiv: 23–48, but the last verse in the English (after the Latin) version is mutilated, and should go on to chronicle how Ezra was "caught away, and was taken up into the place of such as were like him." So the Syriac version, with the Arabic, Armenian, and Ethiopic.

[2] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 217–272.

scription. If we ask which of these is intrinsically the more important, the answer is not easy. The one is distinguished as the first and fundamental ascension; the other as the last, the end of habitual intercourse between the Master and his friends, the farewell. The latter Luke depicts at greater length; the former but completes the act begun when the body came from the tomb. But if we ask which of the two had more fundamental significance for the early church, which was *the* ascension, *par eminence*, the answer is not doubtful. It was the first ascension, the one which formed the concluding act of the resurrection on the third day. For this there is clear New Testament evidence, evidence which at the same time proves beyond all doubt that the event of Luke xxiv: 50 f. is intended as an ascension, and as taking place on the same day as the events of the earlier part of the chapter.

Luke himself is the first witness. Luke ix: 51, "when the days of his taking up were being accomplished" suggests very strongly that at the end of the narrative the "taking up" is to be chronicled. And in Acts i: 1–3 the earlier volume, the gospel, is distinctly said to contain the account of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which—having given commandment through the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen—*he was taken up*. To whom also he showed himself living after his passion, with many proofs, through forty days, being seen by them," etc.[1] A glance at the Greek text is sufficient to show that οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν is *subsequent in time* to the preceding aorist ἀνελήμφθη. It is an act of unjustifiable violence to all grammatical and syntactical

[1] So i: 22 is a reference to the third day, not to the forty-third.

probability to insert the whole of vs. 3, beginning with its *also* (καί), before the preceding "was taken up." The violence becomes intolerable when it is proposed, as commonly, to insert the entire passage vss. 3–8 before the ἀνελήμφθη, which would then be but repeated in the ἐπήρθη of vs. 9. Starting from the fixed idea: there was but one ascension, therefore Luke xxiv: 51 and Acts i: 9 describe the same scene, both texts have been tortured into a meaning they cannot bear, which would never have been suggested save for the desire to harmonise Luke and Acts with each other and with a dogma of the apologist. Let each text speak for itself, and the meaning is perfectly clear. The καί of Acts i: 3 introduces events *additional and subsequent* to those of vs. 2; the μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν depends primarily on ζῶντα ("alive though he had died").[1] The present participles (ὀπτανόμενος, λέγων, συναλιζόμενος) depict the continued activities of the forty-day period, the aorist παρήγγειλεν specifying one element in the recurrent seasons of intercourse. The aorist participle (συνελθόντες) of vs. 6 brings us to a specific occasion of that period; the εἶπεν of vs. 7 and the εἰπών of vs. 9 keep the same occasion before us, and mark it as the closing experience of the period. Just as clearly is ἧς ἡμέρας . . . ἀνελήμφθη (vs. 2) the third day and the opening occasion of the period. Not only here in Acts, but in the gospel narrative as well, does Luke indicate precisely the same thing. xxiv: 26 gives the words of Jesus to the Emmaus disciples, "Ought not the Messiah to suffer these things and to (*not:* rise from the dead, *but:*) enter into his glory?" Resurrection and ascension are one pro-

[1] *Cf.* Rev. i: 18, *ὁ ζῶν . . . καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμί.*

cess, a process as yet incomplete when the words are spoken.[1]

So in Mat. xxviii: 18, when discussing Matthew's account, we raised the question whether he meant to indicate that the disciples reached Galilee in time to see the Master still on the third day. If so, the appearance to the Eleven related by him would be that before the first ascension. It seemed very doubtful that such was his intention, and the wording ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία seems to make this doubt a certainty. The time is *after* the first ascension when Jesus entered into his glory, took his seat at God's right hand, received the supreme name and the Messianic power. ἐδόθη points to a definite past occasion, not to one immediately impending. The scene is the parallel to that of Acts i: 6–9, to which, indeed, it approximates closely in form. In both the mountain is directly mentioned; both have

[1] *Cf.* Beyschlag, p. 479, also Meyer–Weiss, *ad loc.* The words ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν of Luke xxiv: 44 might be taken strictly to posit the ascension as already past, accomplished in the act of resurrection itself, before any appearance to Peter, to the Emmaus-pilgrims or to the disciples. xxiv: 26 might be read in agreement with this view. Then vs. 34 would mean: "The Lord arose and ascended to heaven and from heaven appeared to Simon." So he would come from heaven to the Emmaus-pilgrims, to the gathering in Jerusalem (xxiv: 36), and xxiv: 51 would have no more significance than the ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν after the breaking of bread at Emmaus (xxiv: 31). This is the view of B. Weiss (Meyer–Weiss *ad* Luke xxiv: 44) and Korff (p. 79), and is perhaps not impossible. But in view of Luke's emphasis on the revival of the buried body it seems more probable that he would describe some appearances of it prior to ascension, and the scene xxiv: 50–53 has apparently more significance for him than this interpretation allows. "Yet being with you" may easily mean "before my death."

the apostolic commission more definitely than has Luke xxiv; both think of the scene as witnessed by the Eleven only (so Acts i: 13), whereas Luke xxiv: 33, 50 thinks of a larger group. The omission of any direct statement of the ascension by Matthew is now explainable. This is not *the* ascension, that is, the first; it is only the going away of Jesus, the disappearance after the appearance. It has no special significance or importance. In Acts, also, the author is describing not a phenomenon unique, unlike any that had preceded it, but rather the last solemn departure of a series. Its finality, not its uniqueness, gives it its importance.[1]

The author of the Fourth Gospel, who is most akin to Luke in his narrative here, clearly understands Luke to mean the (first) ascension to take place on the resurrection day. The newly risen Lord says to Mary Magdalene (John xx: 17), "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father; but go unto my brethren and say to them, I ascend (ἀναβαίνω I am ascending) unto my Father and your Father, and my

[1] There is no difference in *kind*, but only of significance, between *αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν* (at Emmaus, xxiv: 31), *διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν* (by Bethany xxiv: 51), and *ἐπήρθη* (on the mount, Acts, i: 9). The curious mediæval identification of the Galilee of the resurrection story with a peak on the Mount of Olives strangely enough brought with it the correct identification of the scene in Mat. xxviii: 16 ff. with that in Acts i: 6–12. *Cf.* Zahn in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. xiv. (1903), p. 775. The same combination is seen in the *Acta Pilati*, and there the shorter Greek recension, to make the combination possible, transports the Mount of Olives to Galilee, the precise opposite of the mediæval means to the same end. *Cf. supra* pp. 350–352, and Zahn, *loc. cit.*, p. 787.

God and your God." The ascension John thinks as following immediately, and the appearance on the evening of the same day (vss. 19–23) is a return of Jesus from heaven. He brings with him the gift of the Holy Spirit (vs. 22), sent from the Father, a gift which was to be consequent on his return to the Father and his glorification (xiv: 16–19, 25–28, xv: 26, xvi: 7, and especially vii: 39).[1]

We cannot, of course, tell what Mark may have once said about the ascension. It is probable, indeed, that he said nothing about it, but took it for granted as a part of the resurrection. This is the more likely since the interruption of the resurrection process by the revival and delay of the body on earth appears in such an undeveloped form with him. For Paul, at an even more primitive stage of thought, there is no "ascension," as a separate act. The uprising (ἀνάστασις, ἔγερσις) was for him a single process, a passing from Hades to Heaven uninterrupted by any halt for physical manifestations at the half-way stage of earth. It was only the emphasis on the material nature of the resurrection, on the revival of the buried body, that ever separated the ἀνάστασις into two stages: the first, from Hades up to Earth; then, after a brief halt, the second, from Earth up to Heaven. No such interruption ever came into Paul's thought; in his list of "appearances" he hints at absolutely no distinction between those coming before an "ascension" and those succeeding. For him, all the appearances, from Peter's to his own, are from heaven; they succeed the uprising in its completest sense. Rom. viii: 34 is clear; it is wholly unjustifiable to interpolate between "raised from the

[1] *Cf.* Brandt, p. 349.

dead" and "who is at the right hand of God" a separate act of which Paul nowhere betrays any consciousness. So, even more definitely, the Pseudo-Paul of Eph. i: 20, with its parallel as to the followers of Jesus in ii: 5 f. For this writer a separate "ascension" for Jesus was as little necessary as for himself and his friends after death. Eph. iv: 8–10 has indeed a reference to an "ascension" (ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος), but the phraseology is carefully chosen to explain definitely that this is an elevation from the lowest *étage* of the universe to the highest, from the κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς to the ὕψος, ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν. An "ascension" whose starting-place is so carefully defined as Hades is not the act described in Acts i: 9, but the ἀνάστασις of which Paul speaks. Precisely the same conception is found in the epistle to the Hebrews (i: 3; x: 12; xii: 2 and the ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν of xiii: 20), and in I. Peter (iii: 21 f.).

There is, indeed, in the whole New Testament only this one presentation; *the* ascension which brought Jesus to his exalted station in heaven, gave him the glorified body and the Messianic power, was either identical with the resurrection, or at least a part of it, following upon the same day. In Mark the angel's ἠγέρθη includes the whole process; Jesus' appearance in Galilee will be a return from heaven in exalted glory. In Matthew *the* ascension and glorification are presupposed, as prior to the only appearance of which Matthew shows knowledge. In John, only Mary Magdalene catches sight of the risen Master ere yet he has gone into the heavens. In Luke the case is no otherwise, save that the tarrying on earth before ascension is prolonged for a period of hours and in this

intermediate interval there are manifestations to more people. Acts ii: 32 f. vouches plainly for this conception, as, indeed, does the whole passage ii: 22–35. For Luke too, that is, the ascension on resurrection day (Luke xxiv: 50 f.) is *the* ascension; the one forty days later, for which he can but make use of much the same phraseology, is described with seemingly more emphasis only because it is the last of the series, the farewell of the Master to his beloved friends.[1]

Outside the New Testament there is much evidence for the same view. It is stated in so many words in the epistle of Barnabas (xv: 9). "We keep the eighth day . . . in which Jesus both rose from the dead and having appeared, went up into the heavens" (ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς). *The* ascension, that is, is Sunday. The final ascension described in Acts i, if forty days after the first, would occur on Friday, the day of Jesus' death, which may possibly have had some pragmatic value in the tradition.[2] The Gospel of Peter, also, places the ascension before any appearance to Jesus' friends. Indeed, Peter has two ascensions, as Luke has, and both are over before the dawn of Sunday. As Jesus utters his expiring cry on the cross, ἀνελήφθη. "And on the night when the Lord's Day was drawing on" the guards "see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following

[1] Aristion's appendix to Mark (xvi: 9, 19) has precisely the same picture as Luke, of the ascension at the end of the third day.

[2] This dating counts forty days *after* the resurrection Sunday; Lake, p. 114, counting Sunday as the first of the forty, reckons the last ascension as on Thursday.

them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens." At dawn the angel declares to the women, "He is risen and gone thither from whence he was sent."[1]

This double ascension in the Gospel of Peter may be the source of a statement by Schahrastani, an Arabic writer of the twelfth century (1086–1153), who in the course of a notice concerning the Gnostics of Syria, has the following about Jesus. "But after he was killed and crucified, he came down and appeared to Simon Cephas, and he spoke with him and handed over to him the authority; then he left the world and ascended to heaven."[2] Here Jesus *comes down* to appear to Peter; *i. e.*, his resurrection took him into heaven, in agreement with the primitive conception. A similar presentation is that of the curious interpolation before Mark xvi: 4 in the old-Latin MS. *Bobbiensis* (Codex *k*). "Suddenly, however, at the third hour, darkness came on by day throughout the whole world, and angels came down from heaven, and rising (*surgentes*) in the brightness of the living God went up (*ascenderunt*) with him, and forthwith it was light." This suggests the account of Pseudo-Peter, and clearly says that Jesus, emerging from the tomb, ascended with the angels to heaven; an antecedent is thus furnished for the angel's ἠγέρθη (xvi: 6).

In the apocalyptic "Ascension of Isaiah" there is the same conception in clear expression. "When he hath

[1] Translation from Swete's edition.

[2] From the German trans. of Theodor Haarbrücker, cited by Harnack, in *Gesch. d. altchristlichen Lit.*, vol. i., p. 10, and by Rohrbach, *Schluss*, p. 33; *Berichte*, pp. 54 f.

plundered the angel of death, He will ascend [*i. e.*, from Hades] on the third day and then many of the righteous will ascend with him . . . when he has ascended into the seventh heaven." And again, "From the angels of death Thou wilt ascend to Thy place . . . in glory wilt Thou ascend and sit on My right Hand." Similarly "they will teach all the nations and every tongue of the resurrection of the Beloved, and those who believed in His cross will be saved, and in His ascension.[but the original Ethiopic word is *resurrection*] into the seventh heaven whence He came." In this latter passage "resurrection" and "rising into the seventh heaven whence he came" are equivalent. These passages Professor Charles dates at the close of the first century, that is, roughly contemporary with Matthew, Luke, and John. They cannot in any case be later than the second century.[1] The apology of Aristides, also, written before 150, says simply "after three days he arose and ascended to heaven."[2] When it is added that in Clement of Rome, Hermas, Polycarp, Ignatius, and the Didache there is no mention of the ascension, and that "Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian continue to regard both events as two parts of one act,"[3] we cannot help agreeing that it is "the

[1] The passages are ix: 16–18, x:14, iii: 16-18, as trans. by Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, 1900. For the dating, *cf.* Introd., pp. xliv f.

[2] Ed. by J. Rendel Harris (2d ed., 1893, in *Texts and Studies*, vol. i.), p. 37.

[3] Schmiedel, col. 4061. The above discussion owes much to Schmiedel's treatment (col. 4059–4061). Ignatius, *ad Smyrnæos*, 3, takes Acts x: 41 (we ate and drank with him) of a period *after* ascension (*cf. infra*, p. 582). It may be added that Origen, Contra Celsum, ii., 65, writes as if " the appearance to the

standpoint of *all* the testimony available from the apostolic and post-apostolic age, that the ascension was conceived to have occurred *at the beginning*, not the end of appearances to the disciples."[1]

The article from which this statement is quoted presents the evidence for it in conclusive fashion, and with all its positions save one we may at once agree. But Professor Bacon is hardly true to the plain intent of Luke's language when he supposes the whole account of Acts i: 4–9 to belong to "the third day," to be the same scene as Luke xxiv: 36–51, and therefore to be inserted before the ἀνελήμφθη of vs. 2. Verse 3, in his view, is "interjected parenthetically," as a general summary of events which also (καὶ) took place subsequently to the event of vs. 2, *but also subsequently to the events of vss. 4–13*. The statement of this latter clause is entirely opposed to the Greek text, in which the participles and verbs of vss. 4 ff. cannot possibly indicate a time prior to the ἐντειλάμενος ἀνελήμφθη of vs. 2. The συναλιζόμενος of vs. 4 is plainly co-ordinate with the ὀπτανόμενος and the λέγων of vs. 3. The position of vs. 3 is also conclusive against the placing of the following verses before it in time; it would then belong in connection with vs. 14. Verses 14 and 15 plainly introduce us to a time after the expiration of the forty days, and the proposal to insert this period after vs. 13 is as violent as the one to insert it before Luke xxiv: 50. The recognition that Acts i: 9 depicts not *the* ascension,

Twelve" came after the choice of Matthias, which (Acts i: 26) was subsequent to the ascension, and that the *Acts of John*, like those of Peter, picture an ascension directly from the cross. (*Texts and Studies*, vol. v., p. 22.)

[1] B. W. Bacon, in the *Expositor*, March, 1909, p. 261. This article appeared when most of the above was already written.

the first, but *an* ascension, the last, would make the whole matter clear.

"Each appearance ended with an ascension" is Schmiedel's terse phrasing of the critical solvent of all the difficulties,[1] or, in words written more than threescore years earlier, "Christus mehrere Male, und zwar nach jeder einzelnen Erscheinung an die Jünger zum Himmel sich erhoben habe, manchmal so, dass er ihnen nur entschwand, manchmal vor ihren Augen sichtbar sich erhebend, so dass die Himmelfahrt am vierzigsten Tage nur darum so bedeutend hervortritt, weil mit ihr die regelmässigen Erscheinungen und Mittheilungen an die Jünger aufhörten." These words are quoted at length, in the original, to call attention to the article in which they occur. After most of the above discussion was complete, the present writer's attention was called to the article through a contemptuous reference by H. A. W. Meyer, alluding to the "anti-Scriptural view of a repeated ascension" set forth by Gottfried Kinkel (a *Privat-dozent* at Bonn) in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1841, pages 597 ff.[2] The article, when read, proved to be anything but

[1] Schmiedel, col. 4061. Similarly H. Zimmermann, *St. K.*, vol. lxxiv. (1901), pp. 441 f., note.

[2] "Historisch-kritische Untersuchung über Christi Himmelfahrt." It is interesting to note that Professor Nitzsch, one of the editors, prefaces the article with an apology for printing anything so "auffallend." Keim, pp. 618 f. (Eng. tr., pp. 379 f.), alludes to the "crude and ludicrous" hypothesis of two or more ascensions, and in a foot-note cites Kinkel. The article, translated into English by Prof. B. B. Edwards of Andover Theological Seminary, appeared in the first issue of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. i., 1844, pp. 152 ff. Thereupon Kinkel's view was adopted and elaborated upon by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in New

"schriftwidrig." With great critical acumen and vigour of treatment, it sets forth the actual intent of the New Testament statements we have passed in review above, with other evidence from extracanonical sources.[1] Kinkel's judgment as to the historicity of one or another statement cannot always be shared by modern scholars, but his article deserves the attention of all students of the resurrection and ascension narratives. In the main its conclusions agree with those here set forth.

We must, then, consider Luke xxiv: 50 f., and not Acts i: 9, as the Biblical account of *the* ascension. The church in its century-long celebration of Ascension Day forty days after Easter is committing a chronological error, and going contrary to the plain intent of the New Testament writers and to Christian thought at least to the end of the post-apostolic age. A glance at Luke's phraseology may offer a final confirmation to the view. "And he led them out to a point (ἕως) opposite Bethany." If the ascension is not to follow, why are the disciples led out to this spot on the Mount

York City University, in his learned and interesting book *Anastasis*, 2d. ed., 1845, pp. 156–162.

J. A. Brennecke: *Biblischer Beweis*, 1819, pp. 8 f., cites an anonymous work, "Beweis dass der Menschensohn, unser Herr und Heiland Jesus Christus, zu dreyen unterschiedenen Malen gen Himmel gefahren sey," no place, 1766.

The learned and eccentric William Whiston published in 1709, as No. 6 of *Sermons and Essays Upon Several Subjects*, a paper "Upon the Several Ascensions of Christ." Perhaps another edition of the same material is his "Dissertation to Prove that our Saviour Ascended into Heaven on the Evening after His Resurrection," which is known to me only by name.

[1] The citation from Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes* i., 46, seems not to have quite the force which Kinkel (pp. 631 f.) would give it.

of Olives? If Jesus is simply to vanish, yet remaining on earth, as he did after he broke the bread at Emmaus, why could he not vanish from the room where he met his disciples? This solemn procession to a height a Sabbath day's journey from the city (Acts i: 12), followed by a solemn farewell blessing, has no motive or significance whatever except as a prelude to the ascension. "And lifting up his hands, he blessed them. And it came to pass, as he blessed them he was parted from them, and was gradually carried up (ἀνεφέρετο imperfect, to prolong the sight of his vanishing body and cover the time of the προσκυνήσαντες) into the heaven." The latter clause καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν is double-bracketed by Westcott-Hort, omitted by Tischendorf and B. Weiss. The Western text is without the clause, and the Bezan codex has here the support of the Sinaitic MS., but all other Greek MSS. have it, as do the other Syriac versions (in substance), as well as the Egyptian (Sahidic, Coptic, Ethiopic) and Armenian, with some of the Latin MSS. It is commonly urged that the words are an interpolation on the basis of Acts i: 9,[1] to which may be replied that they do not in the least reproduce the phraseology of that verse. It is said that there is no conceivable ground for omitting the words, if genuine,[2] to which Professor Bacon replies, "except the desire to avoid contradiction with Acts."[3] This is in truth the mo-

[1] So, *e.g.*, Meyer–Weiss, and, in substance, W.-H.; Plummer; Wellhausen; J. Weiss, *Schriften des N. T., ad loc.;* Loisy, ii., p. 778.

[2] So Meyer–Weiss, Plummer.

[3] *Expositor*, March, 1909, p. 256. Aristion's ending of Mark is based on Luke xxiv, and vouches (xvi: 19) for the ascension in xxiv: 51.

tive which led to the omission of the words in the Western text. The scribes saw more clearly than some modern exegetes that Luke xxiv: 50 f. pictures a scene of the third day, and since the episode of Acts i: 9 is so distinctly dated forty days later, the words which seemed to identify the closing scene of the gospel with "the ascension" must be suppressed. Here too the dogma: only one ascension, has wrought harm to the records. Even if the words were interpolated, the interpolator would have precisely caught the intent of Luke, who *means* ascension here, just as certainly whether these words are his or no. This he himself plainly says, in describing his gospel as extending to the day when Jesus was taken up (Acts i: 1).[1]

"And they, having worshipped him, returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple praising God." The phrase προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν is omitted by almost exactly the same set of witnesses as omit καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, and like the latter phrase, is probably genuine. Its content is not specific or striking enough to lead to its interpolation, as is sometimes suggested, from Mat. xxviii: 17. Those who omitted the "ascension" phrase omitted this as well, possibly thinking that "worship" was paid to the risen Lord only after his exaltation, not during the forty days.[2] In any case this operation on the text shows that those responsible

[1] For retaining the words, *cf.* Merx, *loc. cit.*, pp. 544 f.; Schmiedel, col. 4060 (top); Bauer, p. 275; G. Salmon: *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, 1897, pp. 94–98.

[2] The worship of Mat. xxviii: 17 is after the first ascension, and John xx: 17 forbids it earlier. *Cf.* Völter, p. 23. Bauer, p. 529, regards the words as interpolated.

for it *understood* the gospel passage to describe the ascension, and resorted to this means to bring about harmony with Acts. And so, the Messiah having risen to his heavenly seat of power, the Gospel of Luke comes to its fitting end.

CHAPTER XII

THE FORTY DAYS

LUKE'S gospel closes with the picture of the disciples returning joyfully into the city at the end of the great resurrection day, there to give expression to their gratitude and reverence in constant worship at the sacred shrine of their people. Precisely at this point Acts i: 3 takes up the narrative, i: 1 f. being the summary of the entire gospel to xxiv: 53. Luke now gives us scenes from the next forty days; alternating with the hours of devotion in the temple are seasons of communion with the exalted Master. To them he presents himself, appearing during two-score days, speaking the mysteries of the kingdom and the duties of the apostolate, promising the gift of the Spirit as a gracious power guiding and fructifying their activities.

The word συναλιζόμενος at the beginning of vs. 4 offers a problem. Does it mean "assembling with (them)" or "eating with (them)"? The word by itself might conceivably have either meaning and we are left to contextual evidence. The present participle properly signifies "as he was engaged in the activity" described by the verb. That Jesus spoke the following words "while he was assembling with them" is scarcely sense; all must hear the bidding, or it is in vain; therefore all must be assembled when it is given. But this

would demand συναλισθείς. The present participle could not possibly have that force. Moreover, συναλίζεσθαι in the sense of "assemble" is very awkward when used of one person; the English rendering "being assembled together with them" offends alike against grammar and congruity. The activity going on when Jesus gives the bidding is, then, not *assembling*, but *eating*. This makes perfect sense: as they ate, he bade them, etc. The Vulgate has *convescens;* the Syriac, Armenian, Sahidic, Ethiopic, and Coptic versions have the same reading. So Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many of the fathers understood the word. Augustine takes it in a somewhat more general sense; "cum conversaretur cum eis," "quomodo conversatus est cum illis," "quomodo conversatus sit cum illis" are his three reproductions of the word.[1]

If one asks for the objection to the reading "eating," the usual answer is that the word is rarely found in Greek authors in this sense. But the translators of the ancient versions, or men like Jerome and Chrysostom, may be trusted as to the usage of Greek words. The idea that at these meetings of Jesus with his disciples during the forty days he ate with them, sat down to common meals, is a very definite and important idea for Luke. In Acts x: 41 Peter declares that the risen Jesus "became manifest, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen beforehand by God, to us, *who ate and drank with him* after he rose from the dead." It is natural to suppose that this is not an isolated allusion, that if Luke really knew of such eating together prior to the last ascension, he would mention it in its

[1] *Cf.* Tischendorf, *ad loc.* Brandt, p. 371, has "Verkehr haben," with Augustine.

proper place, especially since he is so concerned to make the most of the physical identity of the risen body, and introduces the evidential eating of broiled fish in the gospel account. There is, then, a presumption in favour of an antecedent for x: 41, an antecedent which can only be the συναλιζόμενος of i: 4. This presumption becomes practically a certainty when we observe that precisely the same verb, in the same form (παρήγγειλεν), "he charged," follows the allusion to eating in both contexts. "Eating with them he charged them" = "we ate and drank with him and he charged us." In either case it is not probable that Luke thinks of but a single such occasion, so that only once did Jesus eat with his disciples and, while at table, give them a charge. The content of the charge in the two contexts is not precisely the same. In x: 42 it is to preach Jesus as Messiah; in i: 4 f. it is to remain in Jerusalem for the baptism of the Spirit. We are at once reminded of a third occasion described by Luke, where Jesus partakes of food and gives charge to his disciples. It is in the gospel, xxiv: 36 ff. Here the word παραγγέλλω is not used, but εἶπεν (vs. 44) in this context is its equivalent, and the content of the charge is simply *a union of the charges in Acts x: 42 and i: 4 f.* The reproduction of Luke xxiv: 45–48 in Acts x: 39–43 is extraordinarily close, even to details of expression; equally closely is the following verse (49) repeated in Acts i: 4. Since Luke himself thus joins together these two passages, let not commentators put them asunder. The very fact that the evangelist models the scenes of Acts i: 1–12 on the scheme of the gospel, xxiv: 36–53, is of itself convincing evidence for the repetition of the eating of the gospel story in the later account. The

elements of the outline are the same—Jesus' appearance (ἔστη: παρέστησεν), the infallible proofs (hands and feet, flesh and bone: τεκμηρίοις), the eating, the charge, the ascension. Again, not that Luke has in mind the same scene, but that he uses the same scheme for the several scenes. The element of the eating can hardly fail in the Acts account, since the others are all present, and we are thus forced by every consideration to give συναλιζόμενος this force.[1]

When Holtzmann urges against this interpretation that "the continuation shows that we are here not in a dining-room, but on the Mount of Olives,"[2] he erroneously takes vss. 4–11 as referring to a single scene, on the last of the forty days. This makes συναλιζόμενος (present) not only co-ordinate, but synonymous, with συνελθόντες (aorist, vs. 6), the latter word, indeed, the mere repetition of the former. The line ought to be drawn after vs. 5, and συναλιζόμενος taken as co-ordinate with the other presents ὀπτανόμενος and λέγων, as depicting the course of events during the forty days. Luke's precise point is to present those days as a time

[1] For the translation "eating," *cf.* H. H. Wendt (Meyer–Wendt, 8th ed., 1899), *ad loc.;* B. Weiss, *Das N. T.* (Handausgabe), 2d ed., vol. iii., 1892, *ad loc.;* H. A. W. Meyer, 4th ed., 1870, *ad loc. Contra*, R. J. Knowling, "Acts of the Apostles" (in *Expositor's Greek Test.*, vol. ii., 1900), *ad loc.;* R. Knopf, in *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., *ad loc.;* Schmiedel, col. 4073, note 2; Brandt, p. 371, and reff. there cited; F. Field, *Notes on the Trans. of the N. T.*, 1899, *ad loc.* Voigt, pp. 98 f., has the reconciling view that in the source used by Luke the word was used in the sense "assembling," but that Luke understands it in the sense "eating together." The latter, at least, is certain. On the general significance of Jesus' eating in the tradition, *cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 207–211.

[2] Holtzmann, *H. C.*, *ad loc.*

of most intimate fellowship and solemn converse, as well as to present their experiences as testifying to the physical identity of the risen body. *Fellowship in the flesh* is what he is urgent to convey. In Acts i: 4 the fellowship idea is in the foreground; in Luke xxiv: 42 f. the evidential idea; in Acts x: 41 the two are well balanced. So in some of the versions and fathers appears an interpolation after Luke xxiv: 43, "and the rest he gave to them," thus making this context also witness to the double idea.

In the scene at Emmaus the same motive appears, there combined with the Lord's Supper motive. There is reason to think that in Luke's mind these common meals of Jesus with the disciples during the forty days were conceived, more or less distinctly, on the model of the later Agape-Eucharist. They may, indeed, have served in his thought as the first Agapæ, of which those of the later church were but the continuation, with the substitution of the consecrated elements for the living Presence that had glorified those primitive feasts of love.[1] At any rate, Acts ii: 46 f. plainly takes up the language of Luke xxiv: 52 f., and indicates that at this time (subsequent to Pentecost) the disciples' manner of life was but a continuation of what it had been during the forty days. There is the gladness of heart and the praise of God, the hours of worship in the temple alternating with house-to-house gatherings, at which the distinctive thing was "the breaking of bread." Just so it was a few weeks earlier, thinks Luke, only that he who then broke the bread

[1] This suggestion, with its relation to Luke xxii: 18, needs a development it cannot here receive.

and gave to them was the Master himself, whose place must now be taken by another.

If one sets down in succession Luke xxiv: 52 f., its analogue Acts i: 14, then ii: 42, then ii: 46, one will have Luke's general picture of the life of the earliest Christian group from the day of resurrection on. It is worth noting how the phraseology binds these verses together.

"With great joy were continually in the temple praising God."[1]

"With one accord continued steadfastly in prayer."

"Continued steadfastly in the . . . breaking of bread and the prayers."

"Day by day continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God."

It is especially noteworthy how the last passage takes up the phrases of the first; "day by day" = "continually"; "in the temple"; "with gladness of heart" = "with great joy"; "praising God."

Every element of the first passage is duplicated in the last, which adds to these the elements of the two intermediate passages, "continuing steadfastly with one accord" and "breaking bread," and adds, besides, a special reference to *the taking of food.*

It is impossible to believe that Luke had not the thought of common meals of Jesus with his followers

[1] Read *αἰνοῦντες* with Tischendorf and W.-H., margin. The creeping in of *εὐλογοῦντες* from its use twice in the immediately preceding verses is more probable than the creeping in of *αἰνοῦντες* from so remote a point as Acts ii: 47. *Cf.* the textual witness in Tischendorf.

during those forty days, at which the breaking of the bread was the culminating feature. The Emmaus episode is but the first of such occasions, the scene that followed it in Jerusalem is the second (obscured, indeed, by Luke), and there followed many more. Luke apparently thinks of these as evening meals, after the analogy of the original supper; so the Emmaus meal and the one later in Jerusalem. The same motive is met again in John xxi: 9 ff., with Eucharistic suggestions. It is Jesus who is the Master of the feast, who prepares all and passes the bread and the fish to his disciples. The meal here is a morning one; so the Eucharist was being transferred to the early morning hour in the first half of the second century. The evidential element is entirely lacking in this account; it is not distinctly said that Jesus himself ate. The emphasis is on the Eucharistic fellowship, or communion.[1] The fish appears, as in Luke, as the distinctive element of the meal.[2] The tracing of the connection of these post-resurrection agapæ of Jesus and his friends, at which fish is eaten, with the stories of the feeding of the multitude with five loaves and two fishes, which are also modelled closely upon the original Lord's Supper and the later agapæ, would lead us too far afield. John vi: 30–59 explains the miraculous feeding as a symbol of the Eucharist, and so the earliest Christ-

[1] This is perhaps the source of the interpolation *καὶ τὰ ἐπιλοιπὰ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς* into Luke xxiv: 43, though Acts x: 41 might also be suggestive. The reading *περισσεύματα* for *ἐπιλοιπά* in one MS. offering this interpolation suggests the feeding in the desert.

[2] Beyschlag, p. 442, suggests a Galilean original for the narrative, even in Luke xxiv, since fish is a characteristic food in Galilee, less so in Jerusalem.

ians understood it, as is evidenced by the phraseology in which each evangelist records it, and by the early paintings in the Roman Catacombs which represent the Supper as consisting of five loaves and two fishes. Most notable is the great second-century fresco in the *Capella Greca* of the catacomb of Santa Priscilla, Wilpert's *Fractio Panis*.[1] And one may feel sure that the fish of Luke xxiv and John xxi is not without relation also to the wide-spread symbol of Christ in the early church, in the figure and name of a fish.[2] Jesus was thought of as ἰχθύς not merely because "some ingenious Christian discovered that the initial letters of the titles of our Lord—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ —formed the word ἰχθύς (fish)."[3] In the catacomb pictures the fish is on the altar or table as one of the consecrated elements, taking the place of the wine, the very blood of Christ. Somehow the partaking of the fish was the partaking of him. Here is a department of Christian origins that needs fuller investigation, but it cannot be pursued further here.

The extracanonical declarations of the eating of the risen Jesus are substantially developments of the episode in Luke xxiv and, like it, follow the evidential purpose. So Ignatius, writing to the Christians of Smyrna, is concerned to oppose with vigour the docetic heresy, and after the quotation from the Gospel of the

[1] These pictures are well described and reproduced in the easily accessible book of Walter Lowrie, *Monuments of the Early Church*, 1901, pp. 223–232. *Cf.* Kalthoff, *Christusproblem*, 2d ed., 1903, p. 46, for a correct insight here.

[2] For this *cf.* Lowrie, pp. 232–236.

[3] A. C. Headlam, in *Authority and Archæology* (ed. by D. G. Hogarth), 1899, p. 418.

Hebrews, already noted,[1] goes on, "After the resurrection he ate and drank with them as fleshly, although spiritually made one with the Father."[2] The Greek text here reproduces the words of Acts x: 41, in free quotation, which shows that Ignatius understood that passage to refer to a period *after the ascension*, when Jesus was already ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί. Justin Martyr also, in his work *De Resurrectione*, argues for the resurrection of the flesh from the example of Jesus, as follows. "And when they were by every kind of proof persuaded that it was Himself, and in the body, they asked Him to eat with them, that they might thus still more accurately ascertain that He had in verity risen bodily; and he did eat honeycomb and fish."[3]

We return to Acts i: 4. "And eating with them, he gave them charge not to depart from Jerusalem, but to await the promise of the Father 'which you heard of me. Because John baptised with water, but you in holy spirit shall be baptised after not many days.' Therefore, having come together they were questioning him, saying, 'Master, at this time do you restore the Kingdom to Israel?' He said to them, 'It is not yours to know times or seasons which the Father put in his own authority, but you shall receive power when the holy spirit has come upon you, and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria,

[1] *Supra*, p. 345. [2] Ad Smyrnæos, 3.

[3] "De Resurrectione" 9. Trans. by Marcus Dods, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. i., 1885 (American Ed.), p. 298. The work is not certainly Justin's, but is at least contemporary. *Cf.* Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 508–510. In view of the above considerations, it is not necessary to assume, as Arnold Meyer does (pp. 163, 168, 211, 214) that the appearance to the Ten came when they were eating a meal together.

and unto the uttermost part of earth.'" These words, modelled on those of Luke xxiv: 47–49, give the apostolic commission for the evangelisation of the world. The time of the parousia is distinctly declared unknown by mortals, and a missionary program is outlined which is not limited by the prospect of its near approach. Plainly the early expectation of the Master's return before they should "have gone through the cities of Israel" is growing dim; history has given it the lie, and the Church is preparing for the conquest of a world which shall endure at any rate long enough to be conquered.

There is a significant omission of Galilee in the missionary scheme. Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria—then out into the world. And this corresponds precisely to Luke's treatment in the body of his book. Chapters i to vii keep the church in Jerusalem; chapter viii pictures, much more concisely, the extension into Judea and Samaria; ix: 1 leaps to Damascus, ix: 30 to Tarsus. Chapter x converts Gentiles at Cæsarea; xi: 19 carries the gospel to Phœnicia, Cyprus, Antioch ("only to Jews"); with the foundation of the Antioch church comes the definite mission to Gentiles (xi: 20), and from that city Paul begins the "first missionary journey" into Asia Minor.

Similarly in Acts xv: 3 there is the curious avoidance of the mention of Galilee; the delegates could not easily go from Antioch to Jerusalem "through both Phœnicia and Samaria," without touching Galilee. xxvi: 20, again, repeats the missionary program of i: 8, with the omission of Samaria. It is "Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judea, and also to the Gentiles." Only thrice is Galilee mentioned in the book of Acts;

two of these allusions (x: 37, xiii: 31) refer simply to Jesus' activity there. In the second of these it is significant that the disciples are described, not as those who had been in Galilee with Jesus, but as *those who had come up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem.*[1] Only in the third passage (ix: 31) is there the most casual reference to a Christian movement in Galilee: "The church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace."[2] Clearly Luke had no information as to missionary work in Galilee or concerning any church there at the time at which he writes. Our sources are too meagre to tell us just what was the state of things there at the end of the century, but there must have been ground for this limitation of Luke's horizon.

The first allusion to a Christian church in Galilee (aside from Acts ix: 31) after the death of Jesus is commonly found in a passage quoted from Hegesippus by Eusebius[3] concerning two grandsons of Jesus' brother Jude. These men were Christians and "ruled the churches, because they were witnesses and were also relatives of the Lord." They are described as brought before Domitian from their home on a small farm, but the location of this farm is nowhere indicated. It is only inference that places it in Galilee, or indeed in Palestine at all, because Galilee was in Jesus' time,

[1] *Cf.* Baldensperger, p. 32, note 38.

[2] It is perhaps not absolutely certain that *καὶ Γαλιλαίας* is original in ix: 31. Blass brackets it as an interpolation, on the ground of its omission everywhere else in Acts, and by Chrysostom and Cassiodorus. So H. P. Forbes, *International Handbooks to the N. T.*, vol. iv., 1907, p. 38, and O. Zurhellen, *Die Heimat des Vierten Evangeliums*, 1909, p. 57, note 4.

[3] *Church History*, iii., 20.

some threescore years before, the youthful home of their grandfather. When we remember the shifting of population during the devastating Jewish war, and the flight of the Christians to Pella, we may be permitted to doubt if these men still lived on ancestral acres in Galilee. Nor is it probable that two small farmers in so remote a province would have attracted sufficient attention to be accused before the emperor and brought all the way to Rome to be questioned by him in person. Indeed, the whole incident lacks verisimilitude; a similar proceeding is related of Vespasian and of Trajan (Euseb., iii., 12 and 32), and even Weizsacker, who quotes it in this connection, calls it a "quite untrustworthy legend."[1]

And so, though the Christian church was born in Galilee, and its first missionary activity was carried on there, no trace of any lasting result has come down to us, nor any explanation of the fact. If we knew the truth, we should have an additional reason for Luke's placing at Jerusalem the appearances of Jesus out of which grew the church, a reason also why the Fourth Evangelist confines Jesus' ministry so largely to Judea, with but few and brief excursions into Galilee. That is history, but history of the last decades of the century, not of the years 29 and 30. It is a strange fact, and its explanation would make a strange story, that the scene of Jesus' life and work, the place where he actually did the deeds and spoke the words that regene-

[1] Weizsäcker, p. 2. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, 2d ed., 1906, vol. ii., pp. 77–96, can offer only faint and conjectural indications of Christianity in Galilee before 325. What is the first *certain* patristic reference to a church there?

rated the world, where he came back in visions to his disciples and consecrated them to the mission which, beginning there, made the Christian church, should, a few decades later, play no part at all in the story of the movement. Even the gospels which record Jesus' appearances in Galilee do so only to put into his mouth the command that the disciples go out unto the nations of the world (Mat. xxviii: 19; John xxi). Their ecclesiastical horizon has precisely the same limitation as has Luke's. We can only note the fact, and hope that further research will make its causes clear.

"And having said this, while they looked on he was lifted up, and a cloud enfolded him from their eyes. And as they were gazing into the sky while he departed, behold two men were standing by them in white garments, who also said, Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into the sky? This Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven thus shall come as you beheld him going into heaven. Then they returned into Jerusalem." The two men in white garments are apparently the same two men in dazzling apparel who stood by the tomb to give the resurrection message to the women (Luke xxiv: 4). The details of the ascension, especially the being borne upon the cloud, are, as the two men's announcement indicates, suggested by the Danielic picture used by Jesus for the parousia.[1] As he shall come, so he departs.[2]

[1] Dan. vii: 13; Mark xiv: 62. (So in Mark xiii: 26 = Luke xxi: 27; Luke here changes *ἐν νεφέλαις* to *ἐν νεφέλῃ*.) *Cf.* I Thess. iv: 17.

[2] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 57. There is an interesting parallel to the ascension in the account of Moses' translation given by Josephus, *Antiquities*, iv., 8: 48. Attention has been called to it by Max Krenkel, *Josephus und Lukas*, 1894, pp. 148 ff.; Holtz-

Such is Luke's testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus as the great foundation fact on which the developing church rests. He offers many new elements in the narrative, all of which are unhistorical, save in the larger sense that they truly express the experiences of the church in the first seven decades of its life. But the primitive tradition Luke has not entirely obscured. He preserves the priority and the importance of the appearance to Peter. Though so briefly and awkwardly stated (xxiv: 34), the very fact that Luke *must* state it, though it fitted so ill into his context, shows how firmly fixed and how important was this tradition. Further testimony as to its fundamental importance is given in Luke xxii: 31 f. "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for you, that your faith should not fail: and do you, when once you have turned again, establish your brethren," a passage peculiar to this evangelist. Peter's faith was rescued, ere it entirely failed, by the appearance of his risen Master, and he, in turn, ministered strength to his brother disciples. From his relating of his own vision and conviction, faith and certainty, and so the vision itself, are mediated to the others.[1] This plain meaning of xxii: 32 is plainly expressed in xxiv: 34. When the Emmaus disciples reach Jerusalem, they are met by the group of the Eleven crying joyfully, "The Lord is really risen;

---

mann, *H. C., ad loc.;* Pfleiderer, p. 474; *Supernatural Religion*, p. 846. It ought not to be used, however, to imply dependence of Luke on Josephus.

[1] That is precisely what Mat. xvi: 18 means. *Cf. supra*, pp. 285 f. and Schmiedel, col. 4085. On Luke xxii: 32 in this connection *cf.* Kreyenbühl, in Z. N. T. W., 1908, pp. 266 f.

he appeared to Simon." Though they wholly disbelieved the women, they believe now, because of Peter's experience. Their faith is restored, though they themselves have not yet seen the risen Master. But that blessed privilege is soon theirs. "As they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them." The absolute historic fact that Peter's vision, reported to the others, recalled them to a faith and an expectation which was a condition of their own not long delayed vision, so graphically expressed here, Luke has somewhat obscured by his apologetic reintroduction of the disciples' doubt (vs. 37). Here he is unhistoric, in every sense, and only the exigencies of controversy would have led him so to offend against reality.

Luke preserves, secondly, the appearance to the Eleven, the other element of the earliest tradition. This appearance he mislocates, misdates, divides into a series, and otherwise misconceives in detail, but its essential significance he has preserved and emphasised, and all his misconceptions of the actual historic detail are the expression of certain truths of the Church's growing life. And finally, Luke keeps the earliest departure of the story from historic fact, the angelic appearance and announcement to the women at the sepulchre. This he makes much of, in its relation to his apologetic interests, but he is true to Mark, as the uninterpolated Matthew is, in ascribing the first appearances to the disciples, not to the women.

BOOK FIVE

THE WITNESS OF JOHN AND OTHERS

CHAPTER XIII

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE resurrection-narrative in the Fourth Gospel can be considered only in connection with the whole problem of the origin and character of that gospel. What is true of the gospel as a whole is true of this element of its presentation. The Fourth Gospel is the work of an anonymous highly gifted Christian, probably belonging to Asia Minor, writing in the first half, probably in the first quarter, of the second century. He knows and uses all three synoptics, so far as they fit his purpose. But that purpose is not the chronicling of the facts of Jesus' biography. Clement of Alexandria had the correct apprehension of the matter seventeen centuries ago. "Last of all, John, perceiving that the external facts [τὰ σωματικά, the bodily, or literal, elements] had been made plain in the Gospel [*i. e.*, the synoptic account] being urged by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel."[1] As the synoptic history gives the body

[1] Quoted from Clement's lost *Hypotyposes* by Euseb., *Ch. Hist.*, vi., 14. Trans. by McGiffert, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. i., 1890, p. 261.

of Jesus' mission to the first century, so the Fourth Gospel gives its spirit, as the author conceived it. Not what Jesus literally said and did is he concerned to set forth—why repeat the Synoptics?—but the larger significance and result of the Master's work, what he has been doing and saying in and through his church in these near a hundred years. The Jesus of this presentation is not the "bodily" Jesus the Galilean rabbi, but the "spiritual" Christ the incarnated word of God, who is the centre of the proclamation of the second-century Gentile church. These things are written that men may believe; they are the church's defence of its Lord. They are shaped by the needs of the propaganda, by the exigencies of the controversy. The Fourth Gospel is a great sermon on the theme: What is the large and permanent significance of Jesus? The question finds a true answer, the answer which the history of the first Christian century gave. If that title did not already belong to the double work of "Luke," the Fourth Gospel might well be called the first great apology of the Christian church. The apologetic tendencies of the Gospel of Luke are found again here, for the most part in more advanced form; the controversies of the time are mirrored even more clearly. The author, himself deeply imbued with the essential principles of Gnosticism, here battles against the Gnostic movement *as it becomes a heresy*.[1] If one seeks a true expression of how the message of Jesus, as embodied in the Church, had related itself to its first-

[1] Of all treatments of the intent and significance of the Fourth Gospel, the one which shows clearest and truest comprehension of the work is E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, 2d. ed., 1910.

century environment, and especially to the religious life of one of its most gifted representatives, this gospel furnishes it. But if one seeks to know Christ after the flesh, and wishes τὰ σωματικά of his earthly career, "John" does not know him so; he can only refer the inquirer to the synoptics. He makes no claim to satisfy these inquiries.

Of the synoptists, as indicated above, it is Luke who is "John's" nearest of kin. Between the gospels of these two men there exists a curious relation, which is one of the most puzzling of unsolved New Testament problems. In the resurrection-narratives this relationship is especially marked. The elements of the Johannine story are almost without exception elements already presented by Luke, though they are developed here in more pronounced pragmatic fashion. None of the elements of the Johannine story is historic. That question is settled with the true apprehension of the gospel as a whole, but the study of the narrative itself would also make its unhistorical character clear. Like Luke, this gospel (without chapter xxi, which is a supplement, to be considered later) presents the "Jerusalem tradition," without allusion to any other. The reasons which caused Luke to set forth this view were operative also in the case of John. The invariable accompaniments of that stage of the tradition reappear here—the emphatic declaration of the physical identity of risen body with buried corpse, and the initial doubt of the disciples. There is little to be learned from the account of John that our study of Luke has not already taught us; we may, therefore, comment on this narrative somewhat briefly.

To begin with the burial (xix:38), Joseph of Arima-

thea has now become "a disciple of Jesus (but secretly, for fear of the Jews)." The beginnings of this process of canonising the orthodox Sanhedrist we saw in Matthew and Luke, and considered its motives. Without delay or difficulty Joseph secures from Pilate the body; in its interment he is assisted by a creation of the fourth evangelist, also a secret disciple and a Sanhedrist, who brings a hundred pounds of gums and spices. The enormous quantity, incredible in reality, is simply the expression of the evangelist's insatiable devotion; it is the parallel to the *clean* cloth, Joseph's *own* tomb, *new*, where never man had yet lain. A precise analogue is the gold, frankincense, and myrrh offered by the Magi to the infant Jesus (Mat. ii: 11 f.). So the regular and formal process of wrapping the body in linen bandages, with spices, "as the custom of the Jews is to bury," will say that this is no hasty, careless burial, but a sepulture carried out with all the lavish care and attention to customary detail that devotion can furnish. How so elaborate a process could be completed in the scant time at hand (vs. 42), the evangelist of course does not ask.

The following details, the pleasant garden (instead of a bare hillside of deserted graves) and the new tomb where no one had yet lain (this from Luke xxiii: 53), follow the same tendency to enrich and dignify the burial and to repeat synoptic statements. The choice of the near tomb owing to the approach of Sabbath correctly understands Mark xv: 42. Sabbath is passed over without a word. Sunday morning while it is yet dark, Mary Magdalene (as to whose presence there Mark, Matthew, and Luke were agreed) comes to the tomb and sees the stone removed, as in Mark.

Without making any investigation she flies to two of the disciples (not to the Eleven) and announces that Jesus' body has been removed, inferring this, apparently, from the displacement of the stone. Her "we know" is a reminiscence of the synoptic mention of other women. The two disciples, Peter and the mysterious Beloved Disciple, who never appears except as Peter's foil, believing her story, start running to the tomb. The Nine, as yet, know nothing of all this. The effective balancing of Peter and the Beloved Disciple, a striking *motif* of this writer, leaves, as always, the advantage with the latter. He believed, though he did not see the Lord, though he saw only the abandoned grave-cloths which Peter also saw.[1] Peter, first to enter in and see the cloths, did not believe. This is clear from the express notice that the other did believe. The two men have equal evidence, equal opportunity, yet Peter does not believe until, with the others, he *sees* the Master (xx: 20). The other is the one man of all the apostolic group to whom xx: 29 applies; he it is who believed when as yet he had not seen. The disciples knew not the Scripture prophecies of Messiah's resurrection; without any such suggestion the Beloved Disciple believed, while Peter waited to be convinced by the Lord's appearing. This visit of the two disciples to the tomb is simply the explication of Luke xxiv: 24, where merely τίνες are spoken of. John's debt to Luke for this loan was repaid by the scribe who in-

[1] Korff, pp. 84 f., turns this verse into nonsense by rendering "believed that the corpse was removed." Despite "Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, and many others," this reading has no significance. Peter surely believed so much!

terpolated Luke xxiv: 12 on the basis of this passage in John.

Meantime Mary has returned and stands weeping by the grave; looking in, she sees two angels in white (from Luke xxiv: 4) sitting at the head and the foot of the place where the body had been. Their place or purpose in the narrative it is difficult to see. They ask Mary why she weeps, and she tells them[1]; then they disappear from the scene without even a reply. The only possible purpose they serve is to act as a sort of guard of honour over the body's resting-place, yet, as the body is no longer there, this is unnecessary. They were not there shortly before, when Peter and his companion were in the tomb; John has brought them on the scene too late to play any real part in the action. They are simply brought over from the synoptic tradition, in its Lucan form, and, deprived of their original office as messengers, are superfluous and awkward. The meaningless question they ask is asked again by Jesus himself a moment later, and the message they were originally brought from heaven to give he takes also from their lips. The scene between Jesus and Mary is delicately conceived and written; only the rationalism that insisted upon its being taken as a transcript of fact has made it necessary to apply to it the processes of criticism. We have already seen how the evangelist understands and clearly expresses the primitive conception of the ascension, to which

[1] Lake, p. 146, curiously says, "She gave no answer." This is only one of several loose or inaccurate sentences which slightly mar a most excellent book. *E.g.* "Mark gives no motive," etc., on p. 171, and "though they did not, according to Mark," etc., on p. 247, might have been more carefully expressed.

here alone, in his account, is there any allusion. He paraphrases Mark's language, in the message to the disciples, and correctly reproduces the thought behind Mark's words. There the angel had said: "He goes before you into Galilee," but Mark was too near the primitive conception to "assume that Jesus made the journey from the sepulchre to Galilee by way of earth."[1] Rather Jesus' resurrection had taken him into heaven, and from heaven would he come to his disciples in Galilee. Over the adjustment of this view to the fact of the empty tomb, Mark does not yet reflect. John *says* what Mark *presupposes;* "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." This appearance of Jesus to Mary, with his repetition of the message which the synoptists ascribe to the angels, (as of the angels' question), led to the interpolation of Mat. xxviii: 9 f. Only in the Fourth Gospel was there originally any statement of an appearance to the women, or of any appearance prior to those to disciples. This specifically Johannine element, entirely unhistorical, is only a developed duplicate of the appearance of the angels. Decisive against it is the fact that it first appears in that gospel which is not only the latest, but whose content is not concerned with the chronicling of history. Paul and the synoptists absolutely ignore it; Luke xxiv: 23 expressly excludes it, and the whole intention of the narrative is against it. The women are to tell the disciples to go to Galilee, they are not themselves bidden to go, and the promise of seeing Jesus is for the disciples alone. The whole point of the narrative would be broken if some one else saw him first. This appearance at the grave is further

[1] Schmiedel, col. 4061. *Cf.* Προάγειν αὐτόν in Mat. xiv: 22.

marked as legendary by the fact that it is not Peter, or any of the apostles, about whom there were fixed traditions, but only a single unknown woman, entirely without place in the later story of the church, who sees him there.[1] The absolute priority of the appearance to Peter may be obscured by the fourth evangelist; he is not able to deny it effectively.

Mary Magdalene comes and tells the disciples (a vigorous correction of Mark), though the evangelist omits to tell us how her news was received. It is not said that they believed at once; conviction must come at the appearance and the word of the Master himself. On the other hand, nothing is said of their hesitancy or skepticism, of which Luke makes so much. This does not mean that the doubt-*motif* is less important for John; he makes as much of it as does Luke. But he does not attribute it to all the disciples; rather he singles out one and makes him doubt for the group. It is psychologically and dramatically a more effective way than Luke's of expressing what both alike wish to bring out. The whole apostolic company is not set in the unfavourable light, while the concentration of the skepticism in an individual allows its sharper statement and sharper rebuke.

The appearance to the disciples that Sunday evening (vss. 19–23) is suggested by Luke. John correctly understands Luke xxiv: 33 f. to picture an evening scene; that "the doors were shut for fear of the Jews" is a characteristic Johannine expansion serving to increase the wonder of Jesus' appearance in their midst. It must not be taken to show that John, after all, does not have such a decided idea of the material nature of

[1] *Cf.* Pfleiderer, p. 3.

the risen body. His point is precisely in the vigorous emphasis of both these things side by side; were the body not fleshly, the passing through closed doors were no miracle; were the doors not fast shut, the entrance of a fleshly body were not so inexplicable. The intent of the passage is quite defeated by those commentators who insist that the doors were merely closed, not locked (would closed doors keep out "the Jews"?), and were silently opened by Jesus himself, or another, to allow his entrance.[1] The showing of his hands and side demonstrates the identity of his risen body with that which had suffered on the cross[2]; the disciples, seeing that it is the Lord, convinced every one, are glad (the "joy" of Luke xxiv: 41), thus fulfilling the promise of xvi: 22, "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice." Of the eleven disciples, Thomas was absent, the Beloved Disciple already believed: Peter and his eight colleagues are those who here believe. The apostolic commission, given in varying form by Matthew and by Luke as, what it in truth was, the essential content of this "appearance," is given by John in brief fashion, and in characteristic form. Luke's emphasis on the consecrating baptism of the Spirit, promised by the risen Master (Acts i: 5, 8, Luke xxiv: 49), is taken up by John, but with an important change. It is not now postponed until Pentecost, but given immediately by Jesus himself, and it conveys full apostolic ordination and the power of ecclesiastical mediation between men's sins and their God.

[1] *Cf.* references in H. A. W. Meyer *ad loc.* (5th ed., 1869, less full in Meyer–Weiss, 9th ed., 1902), and especially Edward Robinson, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1845, pp. 182 f., 300.

[2] On the basis of this verse, Luke xxiv: 40 was interpolated.

In the Thomas incident, the disciple who has been selected to bear the entire burden of incredulity brings his skepticism to vivid expression. "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe." The repetition of the scene, eight days later, unknown to any other source, is simply a duplication of the first appearance, and furnishes a powerful and effective piece of apologetic.

The Thomases of the second century must in truth have been greatly impressed by this striking episode, and the confession "My Lord and my God" must often have followed the closing of John's great book. Its last words, coming as they do just after the scene with Thomas, are extraordinarily impressive. "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye may have life in his name." No one of the synoptics, however true to the actual events, could compare with this book of "John" in compelling and converting power among the readers of the first centuries. In the opposition to false interpretations, in the answering of criticisms, objections, and anxious queries, in the strong insistent presentation of a divine Man as the arbiter of all human destinies, the book possessed unique power. Its author knew supremely how to meet the critical situation of his time; we may never estimate what the Christian church owes to this nameless master.[1]

[1] During the ante-Nicene period, "the literary use of the resurrection-narratives of the Gospels of John and Luke exceed those of Mark and Matthew in the proportion of one to ten." Staudt, p. 87. So rapidly and completely was history replaced by apology.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FINAL WITNESS

THERE remains a further New Testament narrative dealing with the resurrection, that of the "appearance" by the sea of Galilee, given in John xxi. This chapter has long been recognised by critics to be what the text itself so plainly indicates, a supplement to the gospel, which comes to such a perfect close with xx: 31. It is added apparently not any great period of time after the publication of the gospel, not by the author himself, but by a group of men who are interested in sending the gospel into the world under apostolic auspices (xxi: 24).[1] The Johannine type of thought and of language is fairly well reproduced, and most of the chapter is specifically the creation of the writer, or writers, for whom that conception is regulative. The delicate balancing of Peter and the Beloved Disciple is here more pronounced than ever, and the threefold apostolic charge given to Peter, where the question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" thrice repeated, poignantly recalls the threefold denial, " I am not of this man's disciples," is finely conceived.[2]

[1] On the origin of John xxi and its relation to the gospel, see any N. T. Introduction, especially Zahn's full treatment, also Keim, pp. 561–563 (Eng. tr., pp. 313 f.).

[2] *Cf.* Edersheim, vol. ii., pp. 649 f.; Voigt, p. 103; Wellhausen,

What makes the chapter important for our discussion is that it takes account of the earlier tradition (which we have called "Galilean"), which is entirely ignored by the author of the gospel. Here we are brought back to the angel's message in Mark, "Go tell his disciples and Peter, He goes before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him," and find related its fulfilment. Nowhere else in the gospels is there so specific a relation of the event which Mark was plainly meaning to recount when he wrote those words. For Peter, the scene meant, specifically, rehabilitation, forgiveness and reconsecration after his shameful denial, renewal of faith and courage, baptism with the apostolic call and consciousness and spirit. That is, of course, what Peter's vision of his risen Master actually did mean; Mark and John xxi are perfectly correct in their understanding. The very great specific importance of Peter's experience as the first "appearance," which brought to the others faith and the conditions for similar experiences, is not so clearly conceived in John xxi. Something of the priority lingers, but it is all related to the contrast with the Beloved Disciple. The authors of the chapter are plainly concerned to make use of this primitive tradition, as too fixed and too important to be passed over entirely, and as susceptible of being turned to excellent account for their own purpose. The author of the gospel knew the tradition as

---

Ev. Johannis, p. 98; Loofs, p. 34. The latter well suggests that the phrase "Lovest thou me *more than these?*" is intentionally chosen with reference to Peter's boasted superior fidelity (Mk. xiv: 29). Kalthoff, *Das Christus-Problem*, 2d ed., 1903, p. 51, finds Peter here the representative of the ecclesiastical claims of the Roman congregation.

well as they did, but it did not seem to him necessary or profitable to use it. He knows, indeed, of many other signs which he might have used with as good effect as those which he has treated: sovereign over all existing material, he selects as he will. Other scenes, since he was bound by no limitations of conformity to historic fact, would have served his purpose equally well, when manipulated by his wonderful creative skill. The material he might have used, and did not, troubles the authors of chapter xxi more than it did himself; some of it they add in this chapter, to the rest of it they allude in the fine hyperbole of vs. 25.

It is natural to conjecture that for the element of "Galilean" tradition here added, the authors had some written source, and that, further, this source was the lost end of Mark, the content of which it, more nearly than any other N. T. passage, reproduces. This plausible suggestion we have already considered and have found unlikely in the highest degree.[1] John xxi reproduces the tradition of the same event which Mark originally related at the end of his gospel, but the passage in Mark never lay before the later writer. Now precisely this same tradition appears in another synoptic passage, as yet unconsidered, Luke v: 1–11.[2] Here we may find a source for John xxi. Here are the disciples, Peter and the sons of Zebedee and others unnamed, who have toiled all night and have taken nothing. Jesus tells them where to let down their nets, and obeying his command, they take a great multitude of fishes, so as to threaten breakage of the nets. The event produces a great effect on the disciples, espec-

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 166–169.

[2] So Beyschlag recognises, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, p. 523.

ially on Peter. That this is the substance of the episode of John xxi: 1–14 is plain. Each evangelist combines the scene with other details, additions, and emendations; each uses it in his own way, for his own purposes. The difference of chronological setting is enough to show that the two are not depending on a common written source. Certainly Luke would not have placed the scene in its present order in his narrative, had he been using a source that plainly described it as a post-resurrection "appearance." Neither Luke nor John xxi, then, reproduces in detail the scene as Mark portrayed it; the scene itself is enough to show that Mark cannot have so heard the story from Peter. The tradition, as it lingered in the memory of some who may once have read the original Mark, or as it was handed down by word of mouth from the first, was much more general and undetailed. The story in its present form, with the great draught of fishes, is Luke's own creation, and the reproduction of these details in John xxi simply shows use of Luke v.[1]

The genesis of the narrative in Luke's form is not far to seek. In the thought of the church of his time the twelve "disciples" were twelve "apostles." The mission which they had carried on after Jesus' death had been the characteristic activity of their lives; those years quite outweighed the scant thirteen or fourteen months they had spent as Jesus' personal attendants in Galilee. The call by the lakeside to become his disciples really had in it the larger call to go into all the world as his apostles. Little as those fishermen knew it when they left their nets and followed him, they in that moment became fishers of

[1] *Cf.* the excellent treatment in Brandt, pp. 401–408.

nations and of peoples, and entered on the spiritual conquest of the world. That was all crystal-clear in the perspective of the decades at the end of the century, and it shapes Luke's presentation here.

Precisely the same thing happened in the case of the Twelve as in the case of Jesus; the rank and office which became theirs after the resurrection was carried back into the beginning of their part in the story. Exactly in degree as Jesus the prophet of Nazareth became Messiah, his disciples became his apostles.[1] Mark still retains something of the fact that the consciousness of his Messiahship came to Jesus only gradually and late, and that it was not announced publicly until just before his death. Each succeeding gospel carries the Messianic consciousness and claim farther back, and constructs the whole succeeding narrative in its light. So, finally, in the Fourth Gospel, the point is reached at which the book of Genesis begins, back of which it is impossible to go. Ἐν ἀρχῇ the person who on earth was known as Jesus of Nazareth was Messiah-Logos, and from his first appearance on earth he is so known and so ever proclaims himself. This *messianisation* of Jesus' earthly life is not wholly avoided by Mark, and so for him also, the conception of the Twelve as apostles is at times anticipated. What they became after they saw their glorified Master in Galilee they are inevitably thought of as being a year before when they were with him amid the same scenes. So the phrase "fishers of men" (Mark i: 17) has this

[1] The Twelve are called apostles in Mk. iii: 14 (=Mt. x: 2 =Lk. vi:13) and vi: 30 (=Lk. ix: 10); further in Lk. xvii: 5, xxii:14, xxiv: 10. The only other occurrences of the word (not used of the Twelve) in the gospels are in Lk. xi: 49 and John xiii: 16.

larger significance; it was not a Logia-word of Jesus, but Mark's absolutely correct expression of what Jesus' simple call "Come ye after me" had meant in the lives of those two fishermen. Mark has the apostolic age behind him; how could he help reflecting the truth? So the pre-eminence of Peter among his colleagues, expressed in frequent phrases like "Simon and those with him" (i: 36), is true to the situation of the years of the infant church rather than to that of the group at Capernaum in the years 29 and 30. So notably the phrase "whom also he named apostles" in iii: 14, if it be genuine;[1] in any case the words ἐποίησεν δώδεκα . . . ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν say the same thing. The picture of the preaching activity of the Twelve in Galilee (Mk. vi: 7–13) is coloured somewhat by the memory of what they had done after Jesus' death, and in Matthew and Luke it has been wholly remodelled on the later pattern. Mk. x: 28–31 is a passage of great significance in the light of the later decades; its meaning is wholly lost when it is forced to apply literally to the Galilean months. An important supplement to the story of the apostolic age is furnished by the passage x: 35–40. As clearly as Acts xii: 2 declares the martyr-death of James, does Mark x: 39 that of John. Mark, writing *circa* 70 A.D., looked back at the fulfilment of the prophecy which he here records as the solemn utterance of the Master.[2] It is almost

[1] *Cf.* W. H. *for*, and Tischendorf *against*, the words.

[2] The question as to the validity of Irenæus' opinion concerning the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is set at rest by this verse, quite apart from the testimony of Papias. This despite the contrary contention of F. Spitta, in *Z. N. T. W.*, vol. xi. (1910), *Heft* i., pp. 39–58.

superfluous to point out how the experiences of the Twelve "prophesied" in the synoptic "Apocalypse" (ch. xiii., especially vss. 9–13) are *ex eventu* delineations of what had been terribly true. Here the enlargements of the material by Matthew and Luke are very instructive.

In general, then, even in Mark the disciples are from the first viewed more or less in the light of their later apostolic activity; the other gospels carry this tendency very much farther. There was an instructive instance in Matthew (xxviii: 16), where the apostolic commission that came with the "appearance" after Jesus' death was placed on the same mountain where Jesus had originally given them appointment. The later call to apostleship was conceived after the analogy of the earlier call to discipleship.[1] It seems most probable that the first appearance of this mountain (Mark iii: 13) is due, in the last analysis, to the same analogy. Abruptly and pointlessly introduced, without antecedent of any kind, yet with the definite article, signifying "*the* (well-known) mountain," it necessarily has some antecedent in Mark's thought. It is wholly without significance for this passage. Nothing is done on the mountain that could not much more easily have been done below. The whole phrasing is awkward: Jesus goes up into *the* mountain and calls to himself whom he himself would. Literally it would seem that the calling is done after Jesus goes into the mountain, and since this cannot mean that standing on the hilltop he called down to the multitudes below asking certain chosen individuals to come up to him, we must conceive the multitude as going

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 275–279.

with him into the mountain. Then out of the crowd he calls certain by name to come to his side, until he has a group of twelve men standing by him, apart from the main assemblage. Is that really the picture? Why go into the mountain for this scene? And is ἀπήλθον the proper verb to indicate the stepping out of the ranks of the crowd over to Jesus' side? Does not the abrupt "and he cometh into a house" of vs. 20, without any previous coming down from the mountain, the entire lack of connection between vss. 13–19 and their context on either side, argue that this passage is a separate item of tradition that has come to Mark and is here inserted with no consciousness of its original setting? What of the little boat, for example, in vs. 9? It is long for it to wait until iv: 1. Were the disciples really not chosen until the time of iii: 14? What then of "Simon and those with him," of i: 36? What of the "disciples" of ii: 15 f., 18 f., 23, iii: 7, 9? Did not, as a matter of fact, the Twelve come to Jesus in the more gradual, simple way described in i: 16–20, ii: 14 f.? What was done for Peter and Andrew in iii: 14 that was not done for them in i: 17? Was there, indeed, any further, more formal "appointing" until the day when he "appeared to the Twelve" in Galilee, an appearance placed by the pragmatism of the oldest tradition on a mountain?[1] Is not the ἀπήλθον of Mark iii: 13 the parallel of the ἐπορεύθησαν of Mat. xxviii: 16? If the tradition placed the apostolic charge upon a mountain and tended to confuse that call with the earlier attachment of these men to Jesus as disciples, is not Mark also carrying back the later

[1] *Cf.* W. Seufert, *Der Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Apostolats*, 1887, pp. 31 f.

event *with its setting* into the earlier scenes? The antecedent for *the* mountain in his thought would then be the well-known mountain where tradition placed the apostolic appointment; the original connection of this with a post-resurrection "appearance" is no longer clear to Mark. So might be explained the lack of any contextual connection for the passage, so the awkwardness of the situation, so the ἀπήλθον. Finally, is it *merely* a coincidence that this passage, an apostolic appointment of the Twelve upon a mountain, followed by a list of the twelve names, is closely duplicated by Acts i: 6–13—again the mountain, the apostolic charge, the list of names—, the account of the "appearance" and "ascension" of Jesus before the disciples? If these questions suggest an answer which gives the true origin of *the* mountain of Mark iii: 13, we would have a process like the following. Mark borrows it from the tradition of the post-resurrection scene, where it is original, as the only congruous setting for that scene. Matthew (v: 1), who perhaps also has Sinai in mind, as the mount where the law was given "to them of old time," and Luke (vi: 12) borrow it from Mark iii: 13, and so create the famous "Sermon on the Mount." Matthew again borrows it for the "appearance" in Galilee (xxviii: 16), thus unconsciously completing the circle and restoring the mountain to its original connection.

However this may be, the confusion in tradition between the apostolic commission and the call to discipleship beyond all doubt shaped the story of the wonderful draught of fishes in Luke v. Luke is here giving the parallel to Mark i: 16–20, the call of Peter and Andrew and of the two sons of Zebedee. He has

not given the episode in its Markan order, between the beginning of Jesus' work and his visit to Capernaum, but inserts in that place the story of Jesus' preaching in Nazareth. This story he has quite rewritten, in the light of the material of the book of Acts, from its original form in Mark vi: 1–6, so that it stands at the beginning of the story of the origins of Christianity as text and summary of the whole presentation. He came unto his own and his own received him not, therefore must the gospel turn to the Gentiles, is its burden. Luke prefaces his version of the story of the disciples' call with the incident of Mark i: 35–38, to which, by re-wording, he gives the same new significance as to the Nazareth scene. Whereas in Mark Jesus leaves the house and the city before dawn that he may have opportunity to teach in other towns besides Capernaum, in Luke he declares to the Jewish multitudes who beg him not to go from them, "I must preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God to the other cities also, for therefore was I sent." And then Luke lets Jesus illustrate this purpose of spreading the gospel more widely by going out of Galilee into the synagogues of Judea,[1] thus deliberately altering Mark's statement of Galilee. What Luke thus does here in one phrase the Fourth Gospel does in its entire presentation. *The gospel is going away from Galilee;* in

[1] Ἰουδαίας, the reading of W.-H. and Weiss, against Tischendorf, is surely the original here, as the more difficult and the better attested (the reading also of Syr. Sin.). Γαλιλαίας is a correction to fit the context and Mark i: 39. *Cf.* Merx *ad loc.* and especially F. Spitta, *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1907, pp. 14–21. Holtzmann, Wellhausen, Zahn, J. Weiss, *ad loc.*, decide also for Ἰουδαίας.

the book of Acts it is entirely gone, Galilee is no longer a field for Christian missions (i: 8). First to Judea, then to Samaria, then out into the world.[1]

Now, with chapter v, Luke comes to his account of the call of the four disciples. But in accordance with the purpose he has been following from the beginning of his book, he conceives this calling (quite correctly) as a call to the evangelisation of the world. All that was implicit in the call, all that seven decades of history had developed out of it, Luke here puts into it. Luke knew the old tradition of the apostolic commission; it becomes for him here regulative for the earlier call. That apostolic commission had come first and foremost to Peter, had come to him when he was overcome with sin and shame and had recalled him to himself. It had meant for him consecration to a mission whose results embraced the world. It had meant also the contagion of the same experience to his colleagues, to Andrew his brother, to James and John and the rest. All this tradition Luke uses here to give importance and significance to the original call of these disciples. Since Mark's closing passage is lost, Luke has no written source for this, has nothing that defines it as belonging to the post-resurrection period, as being the same material which he uses in Luke xxiv and Acts i.

The original tradition probably connected the appearance to Peter with his return to his fishing activity;

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 383–386. On the whole point, very valuable is Baldensperger, pp. 29–33. The legend in Matthew and Luke that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, contrary to the historical fact of his birth in Nazareth of Galilee, is a part of this same apologetic process, and is not due only to the desire to fulfil Micah v: 2 (Baldensperger, p. 33, note 40).

at any rate, that setting is given by Mark i: 16. The immediate setting Luke takes from Mark iv: 1; with vs. 4 he comes to his more personal interest. Although Jesus had gone into the boat merely to have an opportunity to preach to the crowd, he now says to Peter, "Put out into the deep water and let ye down your nets (χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν) for a catch," as if they had entered the boat for fishing. The sudden appearance of the plural indicates that others besides Peter are in mind. Peter's answer is, "Master, through a whole night having toiled, we caught nothing, but at your word I will let down the nets." The result is amazing. "Having done this, they enclosed a great multitude of fishes, and their nets were being torn. And they beckoned to their partners in the other boat to come and help them. And they came and they filled both the boats, so that they were sinking. And Simon Peter[1] fell on his knees before Jesus saying: Depart from me, Master, for I am a sinful man."

This latter utterance is very curious. What is there in the remarkable catch of fishes to overwhelm Peter with the sense of his own sinfulness? And wherein does this sinfulness consist? He has done nothing wrong; he has obeyed Jesus' suggestion unquestioningly, though all his fisherman's judgment is against its success. The commentators are here in straits. Most remarkable is the fact that the sense of sin comes over Peter at this particular instance. What is there about getting the nets full of fish to make the fortunate fisherman feel guilty? Surely this is not the first time Peter and his companions had filled their nets; the incident is not so extraordinary, at any rate, not miracu-

[1] The only occurrence of the double name in Luke.

lous. We read of conditions to-day, "The density of the shoals of fish in the Lake of Galilee can scarcely be conceived by those who have not witnessed them. They sometimes cover an acre or more on the surface in one dense mass."[1] "One species often appears in dense masses which blacken the surface of the water, the individual fish being packed so closely together that on one occasion a single shot from a revolver killed three."[2] What simpler, then, than to enclose a net-ful? At least this incident should cease to be classed among the gospel miracles!

But even granting that the event were a miracle, we are no clearer why it should develop Peter's sense of sin. We have here, it is plain, an element from the tradition of Peter's vision of Jesus after the resurrection, when, as the figure of the Master stood before him, his own great sin was the one thing that filled his consciousness. He could not endure that the pure presence of him he had denied should be sullied by proximity to his own unworthy self. "Depart from me, Master, for I am a sinner." The situation is as psychologically true as the other is psychologically meaningless. Luke is not conscious of the original significance of this element in the tradition which has come to him; he can only explain it of the amazement at the great catch (vs. 9). But though this amazement is said to be shared by the sons of Zebedee, no conviction of sin is attributed to them. It was only Peter of the group that had sinned and now writhed

[1] Quoted from Tristram, by Plummer *ad loc.*

[2] Capt. Wilson, *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, 1871, p. 341. F. Field, *Notes*, etc., 1899, *ad loc.*, cites from Greek writers two ancient accounts of great hauls of fish.

in an agony of shame; the situation is clearly that of the days following Jesus' death. Jesus' answer to Peter is also psychologically true to the original situation, "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt be capturing men" (ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν). Here Luke has gone back to the original connection in Mark, but Mark's language (ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων) he has significantly changed. The neutral Homeric word ἁλεεῖς (literally: men of the salt, ἅλς, as we say: an old salt) was not pregnant enough for his use. "Thou shalt be one who captures men alive" is what he wishes to say, and says. He is summing up Peter's apostolic career in the word ζωγρῶν.

And it is Peter's apostolic career which shapes the scene of vss. 4–10, which lies outside anything which Luke's source Mark gave him. Perhaps Mark's words "I will make you fishers of men" suggest a contrasted picture of fishing for fish, but it is also probable that the tradition of Peter's vision and apostolic commission told that it came to him while fishing. It is not at all unlikely that this was the fact and that Mark once so related it. Peter must have been doing something at the time; why not fishing, since this was his business? So John xxi and the Gospel of Peter reproduce the tradition. But this fishing of Peter, which is so suggestive of his later missionary activity, which even Mark makes the figure by which to describe what Peter was to be and to do as a result of this call, has naturally great significance. It must be made very clearly to express the meaning it really contains. How shall it symbolise Peter's work as a fisher of men? How else than by picturing his actual apostolic career? In Peter's boat Jesus first addresses the

Jewish multitude near the shore; then the boat and its heavenly passenger go out into the deep, far from shore. There is no longer any audience of people to be addressed; the figure changes, there are fish to be caught. Out in the open sea let down your nets (not now Peter alone, but the others also; χαλάσατε plural). Peter's natural judgment would be against this attempt; nothing is to be caught there, he thinks. And this personal judgment of Peter, here set in the fewest words, Luke has written at great length in Acts x: 9 ff. There, too, despite his own preconceived opinion, at the Master's word Peter let down his nets in the great deep of the Gentile populations, away from the friendly shore of the Law. And there, too, in the persons of Cornelius and the great hosts of Gentiles who followed his leading into the Christian church, there was a stupendous capture in the nets of the gospel. Indeed, the numbers drawn in from the Gentile world soon completely overwhelmed the few primitive Jewish believers, becoming first the majority, then almost the entirety, of the Church. Well may Luke write of Peter, "He was amazed, and all that were with him, at the catch of fish which they had taken, and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon," as we may read again in Acts x: 45, xi: 18, xv: 3.

This, then, is the origin of the passage. Luke is honestly attempting to put into the original call of the disciples, especially the call of Peter and Andrew, to become fishers of men, what he so clearly and truly saw to have been actually implicit in it. With this description of the first call, so understood, he combines elements from the tradition of Peter's later call, which

meant his rehabilitation, and, more specifically, his commission as apostle.[1]

That the author of the Fourth Gospel knew and used all the synoptics, Luke being most influential, we may consider as certain.[2] That the same is true of the authors of John xxi we may be as sure. With the sovereign independence of treatment showed by the Johannine writers, differences of detail and of phraseology are no counter-argument here. John xxi uses Luke v as suggestion for some of its material, but develops the tradition of the Galilean appearance quite independently of the setting in Luke.[3] In Luke's story, there were named only the four disciples of Mark i: 16–20, the two brother-pairs. John xxi has Simon Peter (so called in Luke only in the passage we are discussing), the two sons of Zebedee (never named in the Fourth Gospel proper), Thomas and Nathanael (of some note in the Johannine narrative), and two disciples unnamed. One of the latter might be identi-

[1] The symbolic significance of Luke's story was argued by R. A. Lipsius in the first issue of the *Jahrbücher für Prot. Theol.* (vol. i., 1875, pp. 185–192) to which discussion the above treatment owes much. Lipsius, however, does not see any influence here of the post-resurrection "appearance" to Peter, and therefore mistakenly interprets Peter's sin of his hesitation to let down the nets. As a matter of fact, he does not hesitate at all. Lipsius also sees in the "partners in the other boat" of vs. 7 an allusion to Paul and his missionary companions. But Luke means by them James and John (vs. 10), and so brings the connection with Mark i: 19 f. *Cf.* further Holtzmann, *H. C.*, *ad loc.*

[2] Yet *cf.* Harnack, *Lukas der Artzt*, p. 160.

[3] So Brandt, p. 401; Wellhausen *ad* Luke v:1 ff. *Contra*, Rohrbach, *Berichte*, pp. 58–62; Harnack, *Lukas der Artzt.* pp. 158 f. *Cf.* Hans Schmidt, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1907, pp. 497–506. Loofs, p. 35, reverses the correct relation between Luke v and John xxi.

fied with Andrew. The analogy between the earlier and later calls of Peter (and the others) may be applied in either of two ways. Luke v combines the two to describe the earlier call; John xxi, to describe the later call. The latter account draws freely from Luke's narrative for its embellishment. The tradition of the appearance to Peter after he had returned to his fisher-life in Galilee, with the significance and result of that appearance, gives the starting-point and the object to be presented. Luke v is drawn upon for details of the setting, the authors feeling correctly that here is a presentation of precisely the same theme. But the Lucan story (xxiv: 42 f.) of Jesus eating broiled fish in the company of his disciples, and in general the rich complex of conceptions concerning the risen Lord's eating with his own, as it was related to the Agape and the Eucharist, is of influence here also. In that tradition, *fish* was always a central element, though bread was usually associated with it. In the Emmaus scene, it is bread alone, and the Eucharistic reference is pointed by the emphasis on the *breaking* of the loaf. In the scene with the Eleven (Luke xxiv: 41–43), it is fish alone; in the miraculous feedings in the desert it is both. In each case, the Agape *motif* is clearly noticeable, shaping the details and the phraseology. Here the fish made the common point of meeting for the two traditions, and allowed them to be made into one story. The disciples make a great catch of fish, at the bidding of an unknown man; by this they recognise him as the Lord. They share a meal of fish and bread with him; in this also he is made known to them[1].

[1] Hans Schmidt, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1907, pp. 497–506, has an interesting and suggestive separation of these two elements of the

The two elements are not perfectly fused, and there is much specifically "Johannine" detail, especially in the balancing of Peter and the Beloved Disciple.

A close analysis would reveal many minor points of contact with the sources. For example, the question of Jesus, called from the shore to the disciples in the boat, "Children, have you aught to eat?", is hardly the question one expects under the circumstances. "Have you caught anything?" or the like, is the natural question. Προσφάγιον is something to eat with bread, as a relish, as we moderns take preserves or sauces, and, at any rate in Galilee, would most commonly be represented by dried fish. But to ask, "Have you a bit of fish, to go with my bread?" implies on the part of the questioner a desire to eat. The question, irrelevant enough here, is simply a reproduction of Luke xxiv: 41, "Have ye here anything to eat?" (ἔχετέ τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε). So Peter's casting himself into the sea to go to Jesus is a detail from the similar scene in Mat. xiv: 29, a scene which has other slight points of attachment to the narrative of John xxi.[1] These points of attachment are, indeed, not enough to entitle the story of Peter's walking on the sea to the heading "The Oldest Report of the Resurrection," as

---

story into two distinct passages taken from the original end of Mark. *Cf.* his reconstruction of the latter (on the basis of Gosp. Pet., Luke v, and John xxi), pp. 508–511. Two *traditions* are here combined, but not two written passages.

[1] It may be noted that Peter's walking on the sea, in Mat. xiv, is part of a narrative which goes along with the feeding of the multitude with bread and fish. Compare also Mat. xiv : 26 with Luke xxiv : 37 f.

Professor Kreyenbühl of Zürich has recently very vigorously argued.[1]

The number of the fishes, one hundred and fifty-three, possibly, or probably, had some mystic significance for the writers; what it was is not discoverable by us to-day. It has been a fruitful field for the speculations of commentators.[2] "And for all there were so many, the net was not rent," is suggested by "the nets were breaking" of Luke v: 6. The item that had no significance for Luke except as expressing the greatness of the haul, becomes symbolic of the unrent church when used by the later writers.[3] "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead" is the editorial comment of those who added chapter xxi to the completed gospel. The original scene which we have here an attempt to portray was, of course, the first "appearance," and traces of this fact still cling to the narrative, as is often pointed out. There is nothing in the scene itself

[1] J. Kreyenbühl, "Der Älteste Auferstehungsbericht und seine Varianten," in *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, 1908, pp. 257 ff. Along with much that is fantastic, the article contains many important observations. The same position is taken by O. Schmiedel, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 81 f., and B. W. Bacon, *The Founding of the Church*, 1909, p. 44, note. *Cf.* also A. Plummer, *Exegetical Comm. on the Gospel of S. Matthew*, 1910, p. 427, who notes the parallel of Mat. xiv: 31, 33 (*εἰς τί ἐδίστασας*; *προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ*) with xxviii: 17. Only in these two passages do the disciples "worship" Jesus. Further Loisy, i., p. 942, and K. Kohler in *Jewish Encyc.*, vol. vii., p. 169.

[2] See the "additional note" in B. F. Westcott, "St. John's Gospel" (*The Bible Commentary*), 1904, pp. 306 f.; Keim, p. 564 (Eng. tr., p. 316); Brandt, pp. 405 f.; E. Schwartz, *Über den Tod d. Söhne Zebedaei*, 1904, pp. 50 f.

[3] *Cf.* Holtzmann, *H. C.*, *ad* Luke v: 6.

which indicates that any of these disciples had seen the risen Lord before. But the authors, having in mind the two appearances to the disciples recorded in John xx, enumerate this as the third. The appearance to Mary Magdalene is, of course, not to the disciples. It is possible, also, that this appearance is conceived as *during the rising*, not subsequent to it. In John xx there is no declaration ἠγέρθη from the angels or another; the first such statement is Jesus' own word, in the present tense (ἀναβαίνω, xx: 17). Ascension is practically the equivalent of resurrection; it is at least the concluding and decisive part of the process. The ecclesiastical usage of centuries has so stamped technical significances upon these words that we make a difference between them enormously wider than any Greek writer or reader could feel between ἀνάβασις and ἀνάστασις.[1]

The position of xxi : 14 is a little curious. The natural place for a comment of this sort is at the end of the scene, not in its midst, according to the analogy of ii: 11, iv: 54. The reason for the introduction of the comment at this point is, however, obvious. This is the end of the material which the authors are drawing from the tradition, either oral or written. Tradition told how in the draught of fishes, in the breaking of bread, Jesus had been manifested to his disciples, and that tradition is now recounted. As to what follows, it is purely and simply the creation of the authors, in which the apostolic charge to Peter is used for a final expression of his relation to the Beloved Disciple. Peter's martyrdom is plainly "prophesied," and the

[1] Or, indeed, ἔγερσις, though the latter word is used only in Mat. xxvii: 53.

Beloved Disciple's death is as plainly the motive of the concluding part of the scene. Into these Johannine subtleties we cannot enter. With vs. 13, as the authors rightly felt and stated, we come to the end of the material that has any relation to the resurrection of Jesus.[1]

But one more New Testament passage demands our notice. It has recently been suggested by a number of scholars that the transfiguration of Jesus upon the mountain is, in its origin, the "appearance" of the risen and glorified Jesus to Peter, perhaps including the appearance to the Twelve.[2] Wellhausen is clearly right, at least, in declaring the "Verklärungsgeschichte . . . eine Unterstreichung und himmlische Beglaubigung des Petrusbekenntnisses," as Bacon had earlier shown at length.[3] It but repeats the scene at Cæsarea Philippi in more vivid form. Primarily Peter, secondarily the others, apprehend their Master as the Messiah. In the one case it is the intuition, the insight of the apostle to whom flesh and blood had not

[1] Voigt, pp. 101–103, argues that the "Lovest thou me?" scene is a description of the original "appearance" to Peter, though it is erroneously placed here after the shore-breakfast, belonging historically after John xx : 10. Peter and John leave their lodgings for a walk on the Mt. of Olives; John falls behind and the Master appears to Peter, who, looking back at the distant John, asks "What shall this man do?"

[2] Holtzmann, *H. C.*, p. 86; Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*, p. 77; Kreyenbühl, *Z. N. T. W.*, vol. ix. (1908), pp. 258 f., 277–279; Loisy, vol. ii., pp. 39 f.; B. W. Bacon, *Am. Jour. Theol.*, vol. vi. (1902), pp. 258–265; *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, p. 122; K. Kohler, *Jewish Encyc.*, vol. vii., 1907, p. 169.

[3] Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*, p. 70; Bacon, *Am. Jour. Theol.*, 1902, pp. 236 ff.

revealed it, in the other, it is a vision of the glorified Master in the shining body of his heavenly life, accompanied by his two witnesses Moses and Elijah. This heavenly glory becomes his only after his death and resurrection into the heavenly places. The Jesus whom Peter, James, and John see on the mountain is not Jesus as he is, or ever has been at that time, but as he is to be after "his decease which he is about to accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke ix: 31). In this sense, the narrative is of a post-resurrection episode, though that is not its primary significance.

What we have here is, in reality, one more witness to the curious double aspect borne, in the gospels, by Jesus' Messiahship and all elements connected with it. Jesus the Galilean prophet dreamed that he was one day to be Messiah, that after his death he was to rise from Sheol into the heavenly places and be endowed with the Messianic glory and power. Thus as the Danielic Son of Man, he should come on the clouds of heaven to do Messiah's work and set up the Kingdom. He is not Messiah while he lives, he becomes so only after his death, through his resurrection.[1] So Paul and the earliest Christians conceive the Messiahship, in precise agreement with Jesus. But the generation passed, and the Parousia failed. As men become increasingly certain that Jesus is not coming again as Son of Man—at least till the far-off end of time—they

[1] This is gradually being recognised as the true solution of the "Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien." *Cf.* C. Piepenbring, *Jésus Historique*, 1909, p. 168. "Jésu n'a jamais cru être, de son vivant déjà, le Messie, effectif et présent, mais seulement le Messie futur, de même qu'il n'a jamais considéré le royaume de Dieu comme vraiment présent."

begin to feel that if Jesus is to be Messiah at all, he must, however difficult the adjustment, have been Messiah during his earthly life. And so the earthly life as Galilean rabbi and prophet becomes *Messianised.* The experiences of the Christians and of the gospel in the first century are carried back into the story of his life. He becomes Messiah then and there, and the wonder-deeds of Messiah are ascribed to him. His disciples sharing his simple life in Galilee become apostles carrying his gospel to the world, heard before governors and kings; his message itself becomes the proclamation of the growing church.[1] Experiences and convictions of the later Christians, rites and observances of the later church, are carried back into the narrative of his intercourse with his disciples. The gospels are not merely gospels, but church histories of the first century as well. John's gospel gives no longer the account of what Jesus and the Twelve did before the crucifixion, but of what the Logos-Messiah and his "friends" did after it.[2] But even in the synoptics the original event is often seen in the light of the later experience, the ultimate working out of what was implicit in the event.[3]

At Cæsarea Philippi Peter recognised that his Master was no other than he who was to be Messiah. It is a sort of premature anticipatory recognition of the Messiahship. In the "appearance" which comes to

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 402–405.

[2] *Cf.* W. Van Manen, *Die Unechtheit des Römerbriefes*, 1906, p. 230. "Johannes oft Geschichte des Christentums schreibt, während er scheinbar nur Worte Jesu und Erzählungen über sein Leben mitteilt."

[3] This is well put by Baldensperger, pp. 26 f.

him after Jesus' death Peter recognises that Jesus *is* Messiah, now, already exalted at the right hand of God, endowed with power and the glory of the spirit-body, given the name that is above every name. These two Messianic recognitions on the part of Peter (the same thing is true in the case of the ten disciples) blend to form the transfiguration story. Its actual content is precisely the same as that of the scene at Cæsarea Philippi; but now it is the glorified Messiah of the heavenly life who is manifested.[1] The revelation is not made by flesh and blood; the Father himself gives divine attestation to the Son of his love, and the Law and the Prophets, in the persons of Moses and Elijah, who also had escaped Sheol and were in the heavenly world, hold converse with him. This revelation, too, comes to the disciples on a high mountain; it is "the mountain where Jesus had appointed them" (Mat. xxviii: 16).[2] The cloud overshadowing them, out of which comes the attesting voice, is the Schechina-cloud which enshrouds the divine presence, the cloud which receives Jesus out of his disciples' sight at the ascension (Acts i: 9). The latter scene is the parallel to that of Mat. xxviii: 16 f. where the cloud might likewise have appeared.

There is therefore a close relationship between the tradition of the "appearance" of the risen Jesus to Peter and to the Ten and the transfiguration narrative. This is clear, further, from Mark ix: 9 f., with its significant command that this occurrence should not be told until after Jesus' resurrection, and its allusion to

[1] So Volkmar, p. 240. *Cf.* Pfleiderer, pp. 690 f.

[2] So Pfleiderer, p. 601; Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*, p. 75. It is "the holy mountain" of II Pet. i: 18.

the disciples' lack of understanding as to what "rising from the dead" might mean. In truth the event, in its fulness, did not occur until after Jesus had risen, when the disciples knew from their Master himself, what it meant to rise from the dead. But the prime significance of the transfiguration is the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, rather than as risen from the dead. Yet the two things go together; he became Messiah in fact when he rose from the dead, and the resurrection was the attestation to the disciples that he was in truth the Anointed One of God, as he had claimed. It is but a matter of emphasis.[1]

Finally, we may notice here certain of the extra-canonical passages bearing on Jesus' resurrection, in addition to those of which mention has already been made. The "Gospel of Peter" has been considered, and one statement from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." The latter work, dating from early in the second century, is notable further as having the only other notice of the "appearance" to James, recorded by Paul (I. Cor. xv: 7). The passage reads, "But the Lord, when he had given his linen cloth (sindonem σίνδονα) to the servant of the priest went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which the Lord had drunk the cup, until he should see him risen from them that sleep." And again, after a little, "Bring,"

[1] The details of the transfiguration-story are used in the opening part of the extant fragment of the *Revelatio Petri*. Bacon (*Am. Jour. Theol.*, 1902, p. 259) and M. R. James (*The Gospel According to Peter and the Revelation of Peter*, 2d. ed., 1892, p. 254), think that the scene in the latter is placed subsequent to the resurrection, but there is no sure indication of this in the text.

says the Lord, "a table and bread." And immediately is added, "He took up bread and blessed and broke and gave to James the Just and said to him: My brother, eat your bread, because the Son of Man has risen from them that sleep."[1] The Latin MSS. of Jerome read *biberat calicem Domini* "he had drunk the Lord's cup," but the Greek translation has ὁ κύριος, and ancient quotations, as well as the context itself, make it clear that James's oath is represented as dating from Jesus' death, not from the Lord's Supper, at which James was not present.[2]

There seems to be here only a development of the tradition so briefly set down by Paul, with no detail that can be adjudged historic. The gospel narrative leaves James with the judgment on his lips that his brother is beside himself and must be put in restraint (Mark iii: 20 f., 31–35). We next meet him as an apostle, occupying a leading position in the Jerusalem church (Gal. i: 19, ii: 9–12; Acts xii: 17, xv: 13). Just how early he became a member of the Christian group we cannot tell (Acts i: 14 cannot be used as evidence); it was at any rate before the year 38 (Gal. i: 19), prob-

[1] Quoted by Jerome from the "Evangelium quod appellatur 'secundum Hebraeos,'" in his *De Vir. Ill.*, chap. ii. The *lacunæ* are apparently unimportant.

[2] So J. B. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 2d ed., (Andover, Mass., 1870), p. 110; Rudolf Handmann: "Das Hebräer-Evangelium" (*T.u.U.* vol. v., part iii), 1888, pp. 79–82; Brandt, pp. 392 f.; Rohrbach, *Berichte*, p. 73; Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 650, note 1. For the reading *Domini*, E. B. Nicholson, *Gospel Acc. to the Hebrews*, 1879, pp. 66–68; Schmiedel, cols. 4045 f.; Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kan.*, ii., pp. 700 f.; *Forschungen*, vi., p. 277; Arn. Meyer in *Hennecke's Handbuch*, pp. 34 f.; P. W. Schmidt, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, ii., 1904, pp. 110 f.; Bauer, p. 164.

ably not long after Jesus' death. That he had "seen" the risen Jesus is the fitting explanation, indeed the only explanation, of his being an apostle. But that he believed in his brother's Messianic mission before Jesus' death is quite unlikely; quite impossible is it that he should have sworn to fast till he should see Jesus risen from the dead. It was doubtless his "vision" that converted him, as was the case with Paul, and even if his conversion had preceded, none of the disciples expected Jesus to rise from the dead in the sense here indicated. The giving of the grave-cloth to the priest's servant—apparently the man who lost his ear (Mark xiv: 47), called Malchus in John xviii: 10, is the person intended—seems to imply that this servant was sharing the watch at the tomb, and is to show the cloth to his masters as an indubitable proof that Jesus has risen.[1] In the breaking, blessing, and eating bread, the Eucharist *motif* is again apparent, but the evidential purpose of the bread is also not wholly absent. Brandt supposes the other resurrection-fragment ascribed by Jerome to the Gospel of the Hebrews[2] to belong to this same connection, fitting into the *lacunæ* indicated by the "rursusque post paululum" and "statimque additur."[3] This is a possible construction, and would emphasise the evidential purpose still more strongly. The allusion to the dead as *dormientes* instead of *morti* is a reflection of Pauline usage.

In the Syriac *Didascalia*, a work of the third century,

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 64. This episode would make the first appearance, not to followers, but to an unbeliever. It is the oldest allusion to an appearance to any one save Jesus' followers. Mat. does not say that the guard saw Jesus, though Ev. Petri does.

[2] *Cf. supra*, pp. 345 f. [3] Brandt, pp. 393 f.

we read, "During the night before the dawn of the first day of the week Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene and Mary the daughter of James, and in the morning of the first day of the week he entered the house of Levi, and then he appeared also to us; moreover he said to us while he was instructing us: Wherefore do ye fast on my account in these days, and why is it needful for me that ye chasten yourselves?"[1] The fasting and the mention of Levi in this connection appear also in the Gospel of Peter, though details are not alike.

The Diatessaron of Tatian seems to have had a statement that Jesus appeared to his disciples in Capernaum. At least Ephraem Syrus, commenting on the gospel according to the Diatessaron, writes, "Consolationem ergo, quæ prius iam disposita erat, in effectibus nobis dedit per resurrectionem suam, et cum discipulos suos in Capharnaum, urbe consolationis, congregasset."[2] This, thinks Zahn, is a "Specialisirung von Galiläa"; at any rate, it vouches for the "Galilean tradition," and as Capernaum was the home of several of the disciples, it may easily have been the actual scene of the "appearance."

So may end our examination of the witness for Jesus' resurrection. It is a long way from Paul's "He arose . . . he appeared," to the earthquake and angels,

[1] *Cf.* H. Achelis and J. Flemming, *Die Syrische Didaskalia übersetzt u. erklärt*, 1904, p. 107. Above trans. from Schmiedel, col. 4049. *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 76.

[2] Latin trans. of the Armenian version of Ephræm, in G. Mösinger, *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio*, etc., Venice, 1876, pp. 272 f. *Cf.* Zahn, *Forschungen*, vol. i. (Tatian's Diatessaron), pp. 218 f.; Rohrbach, *Schluss*, pp. 50 f.; *Berichte*, pp. 67–72.

the bread and the fish, the flesh and bone, of the later writers. But it is a way the logic of the situation compelled the church to travel, and to travel it after the church will let us see, as no other course will, the inner and outer conflicts of those formative years.[1]

[1] J. Weiss, *Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., p. 41, gives an excellent brief popular sketch of the growth of the tradition. *Cf.* also Arnold Meyer, pp. 171 f. An Ethiopic apocryphal fragment now in England chronicles an appearance to Pilate. *Cf.* Clemen, in *Stud. u. Kr.*, 1894, p. 759.

BOOK SIX

RESULTS

CHAPTER XV

TIME AND PLACE

THE following table gives an oversight of the chief elements in the accounts we have been considering.

1. Appearance to Peter (with others? while fishing?).
2. Appearance to the Eleven (in Capernaum?) with their apostolic commission.
3. Angel-vision to women.
4. Visit of disciples to tomb.
5. Proof of bodily identity, offering body to sight and touch.
6. Emmaus incident.
7. Appearance of Jesus to women.

1. Attested by	Paul	Mark		Luke		John xxi
2. " "	Paul	Mark[1]	Mat.	Luke	John	
3. " "		Mark	Mat.	Luke	John	
4. " "				Luke	John	
5. " "				Luke	John	
6. " "				Luke		
7. " "					John	

[1] "There shall *ye* see him" is Mark's witness to the fact that the Ten, as well as Peter, saw the risen Jesus in Galilee. Whether Mark described this appearance separately from that to Peter is not wholly clear.

Paul attests	1.	2.						
Mark "	1.	2.	3.					
Mat. "		2.	3.					
Luke "	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.		
John "		2.	3.	4.	5.		7.	
John xxi "	1.							

Paul posits two initial appearances, that to Peter and that to "the Twelve." These two, the first of which meant the rehabilitation of Peter and his dedication to apostolic activity, the second of which assured the Ten that Jesus lived and sent them out to be his messengers, have a fixed place in the tradition and a sure basis in historic fact. But they alone, of the incidents of the gospel narrative, have such fixed place and sure historic basis. For they alone occur in the proclamation of Paul, as part of that body of truth of which he was spokesman, as were the other apostles of his time. Fundamental elements in his preaching, of whose truth he was persuaded by the personal testimony of the recipients of these "appearances," his gospel and his Christian life stand or fall with them. Further, the various accounts which attest them are independent of each other. How different is the case with the other elements of the above table. None of them forms any part of the apostolic proclamation, nor is ever so much as suggested in any Pauline letter. The appearance of angels to women at the empty tomb meets us only after the chief apostles (if not all) are dead, and Jerusalem is laid waste. It is reproduced by succeeding writers, *all of whom are dependent on Mark*, with no independent testimony, however they vary the details of the wonder-story. The number and names of the women change, as do the number and

position of the angels and the wording of their message; so the exact errand of the women and their subsequent action. But these are only variations of a literary sort on the story as presented by Mark.

So far as a critical study of the gospel tradition goes, then, historic fact can be predicated only of the two appearances which Paul cites at the beginning of his list. Both these took place in Galilee; both meant for their recipients the consecration to a definite life-career as missionaries of the Messiah. The other four "appearances" cited by Paul lie outside the limits of the gospel narrative; to no one of them is there any adequate reason for denying historicity. The appearance to five hundred brethren at one time cannot be questioned even by the psychologist,[1] and Paul surely does not make it an element in his preaching, while most of the five hundred are still living, while Peter and others of the Twelve are active and well known, without being sure of his ground. It has been argued with some plausibility that the Pentecost scene of Acts ii: 1–4 is a traditional expression of this appearance.[2] It would then offer a parallel to the giving

[1] For striking parallels, *cf.* Schmiedel, col. 4083, also *H. C.*, vol. ii., part i., 2nd ed., 1892, pp. 188 f.; *Supernatural Religion*, pp. 881 f. *Cf.* Hausrath, *Jesus und die N. T. Schriftsteller*, 1909, vol. i., p. 107. Further, a paper by the Rev. A. T. Fryer, "Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival," 1904–5, in the *Proceedings* of the S. P. R., vol. xix., 1907, should be noted.

[2] So, *e.g.*, A. Hausrath, *History of N. T. Times. The Time of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., vol. ii., 1895, pp. 116–119; *Jesus und die N. T. Schriftsteller*, 1909, vol. i., pp. 107, 110; Steck, *Galaterbrief*, 1888, pp. 185 f.; Pfleiderer, pp. 10, 478 f.; Lake, pp. 202–205; Wernle, p. 37; Wellhausen, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 94; and especially von Dobschütz, pp. 33–39. *Contra*, Schmiedel, col. 4057 *b*. Perhaps

of the spirit at the appearance to "the Twelve" in John xx : 22. Whether there actually was any such lingering of the tradition in Luke's mind here must remain forever uncertain; its possibility may be granted.

There follows the appearance and the apostolic call to James and to each of the apostles, one by one.[1] It is noteworthy how constantly these two things are co-ordinated, the vision of the risen Lord, and the commission as his apostle. Every appearance noted by Paul, beginning with Peter's and ending with his own, made an apostle, a missionary of the new faith, out of its recipient.[2] "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" We may safely make this a criterion of the historicity of the recorded appearances; *those which are actually historic made missionaries.* That this is true concerning the five hundred there is no occasion to doubt, but again Mary Magdalene (John

---

a real connection of the Pentecost scene with Paul's "above 500 brethren" is suggested by the anonymous author of *Resurrectio Christi*, 1909, pp. 9, 56, 59. The reference is to the Ethiopic Acts of Peter, and the passage is found (in English) in E. A. Wallis Budge, *Contending of the Apostles*, vol. ii., 1901, pp. 476 f., where we read that the outsiders who *witnessed* the Pentecost miracle of tongues were more than 700, of whom "more than 500" were "men of the Hebrews" (*cf.* Acts ii : 5). Budge's translation was made from a 17th cent. manuscript, but the material is old. It may be worth noting that in *Acta Pilati*, B, xii: 2, the guard placed at the tomb, who witness the descent of the angel and the attendant phenomena, are "five hundred soldiers."

[1] Arnold Meyer, p. 177, quite erroneously says, "All the apostles were, according to Paul, *together* at the last appearance," and so (pp. 170 f.) he would identify this appearance with the Pentecost scene. Voigt, p. 28, falls into the same error.

[2] *Cf.* Voigt, pp. 38 f.

xx : 14) is definitely excluded. Last of all the apostolic company cited, Paul is called to his glorious life-work by the vision of the Master. Details of that experience we may not inquire; but that he saw and was conquered, it is the task of his remaining years to testify. The ἔσχατον πάντων does not mean that after the call of Paul Jesus did not, and could not, appear again. It is practically a "finally," or "last of the present list of apostles so called." Paul's own experience makes a fitting close to the series he is citing, and the feeling of self-debasement so forcibly expressed in ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι is also largely responsible for the ἔσχατον πάντων. "For I am the least of the apostles" (vs. 9) supports this sense of vs. 8.[1]

As to the time and place of the appearances Paul says nothing. The first two, according to the oldest testimony, took place in Galilee; that to Peter perhaps while he was engaged in his fisher's work on the lake, that to the others probably in or near Capernaum. The first appearance can hardly have come as early as the third day, for, as we have seen, it is practically impossible that the disciples could reach their homes, especially in view of the intervening Sabbath, as early as Sunday.[2] But it must have come soon after Peter's return to Galilee, while the impression of the catastrophe, and of his own weakness, was still strong upon him. The appearance to the other ten almost certainly followed hard on Peter's relation to them

[1] *Cf.* Origen, Contra Celsum ii : 65, who in this connection says, "probably the ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ [of Eph. iii : 8] is equivalent to the ἐκτρώματι."

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 258. *Cf.* Beyschlag, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1899, p. 510. *Contra*, Schmiedel, col. 4068.

of his experience, and the kindling of their hope and expectancy.[1]

The appearance to James occurred, in all probability, also in Galilee, where he was at home. We do not read that he attended the fatal Passover at Jerusalem, nor, if he were there, would his stay naturally be prolonged beyond the limits of the feast. The apocryphal notice in the Gospel of the Hebrews is of no help here. The five hundred who together saw the risen Lord must also be sought in Galilee; only there could so large a number of Jesus' adherents have been gathered in the period immediately succeeding his death.[2] This appearance must have come rather early, as it precedes that to James; and inevitably the experience of "the Twelve" would prepare the way among the enthusiastic adherents of the prophet of Nazareth for a similar manifestation to the larger number. Even if Luke should be thinking, in the Pentecost story, of the Five Hundred, yet neither his date nor his location has the slightest historical value. They are a part of the pragmatism of his purpose. The separate appearances to the apostles we cannot, of course, localise or date; with them we leave the limits of Galilee and the circle of Jesus' first followers. They fill the four

[1] *Cf.* Voigt, p. 26.

[2] See this well argued by Keim, p. 534 (Eng. tr., p. 282), and Korff, p. 107. Kreyenbühl, in *Z. N.T.W.* vol. ix. (1908), pp. 275–277 places this appearance in Jerusalem, and (pp. 277–279) identifies it with the transfiguration scene. "Perhaps it was 'Pentecost.'" Bacon, *Founding of the Church*, 1909, p. 54, also places this scene in Jerusalem and at Pentecost. Voigt, pp. 32–34, has a regular progression in the appearances, those to Peter and the Twelve in Jerusalem, that to the five hundred on the way to Galilee, the others in Galilee.

or five years succeeding the Master's death; and finally, in the year 35, according to the most probable chronology of the apostolic age, he appeared to Paul also, an experience which the apostle himself (Gal. ii: 17) justifies Luke in placing at or near the city of Damascus.[1]

Galilee, then, is the scene, not only of Jesus' mission, but of the birth of his church, of the first mission of his followers. Jerusalem comes into his story only as the scene of the last five days of his life, and of his martyr-death. The Christian mission there was not the original foundation, but an offshoot of the enthusiastic movement in the northern province. That the disciples (with the probable exception of the traitor Judas) fled to Galilee after their Master's arrest and speedy death is put beyond question by Mark xiv: 27 (xvi: 7) and the whole of the earliest tradition, which is explainable on no other theory.[2] Not even Luke's express denial gives the slightest ground for doubting the fact, or for Beyschlag's epigram, that this flight of the disciples is "weiter nichts als die Flucht der Kritik vor der in Jerusalem vorhandenen Grabesinstanz."[3]

[1] On the chronology of the appearances *cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 172–178. Making that "to all the apostles" a single incident, he places it, with that to the 500, not long before Paul's conversion, and in Jerusalem, as the largest of the congregations. The visions of Peter and "the Twelve" come soon after Jesus' death, and so only these get into the gospel narrative, as connected with the story of his earthly career. For a criticism of Meyer's chronology here, for the most part well taken, *cf.* Korff, pp. 205 f.

[2] *Cf.* the plain statements of Justin, *Apol.*, i., 50; *Trypho*, 53, 106.

[3] Beyschlag, p. 439. *Cf.* also Korff, pp. 94–101, where the judgment is expressed that the flight to Galilee is "eine unrühmliche Erfindung der kritischen Theologie, die ihren geschichtlichen Sinn durchaus nicht zur Ehre gereicht."

Mark was of another opinion. Though Jesus came from his grave in Jerusalem, though his disciples are there, where a meeting could take place at once, simply and easily, yet he must depart for Galilee, his disciples must be bidden by an angel's voice to follow him, for *only there*, so fixed and strong is the tradition, can they see him. The very fact that as soon as the empty tomb makes its appearance in the narrative, it is only certain women who come into any relation with it, the disciples nowhere appearing, shows clearly that for the earliest tradition the disciples were not conceived as still in the city after Jesus' death.[1] Unless Galilee had actually been the scene of the experiences, no one, *at the time when the gospels were written*, could or would possibly have invented these allusions. The whole tendency of the tradition was away from Galilee, toward Jerusalem.[2]

It is commonly taken for granted, on the basis of the first chapter of Acts, that the eleven disciples were to be found in Jerusalem at any rate within a month after Jesus' death, and this is held to give ground for the possibility, or probability, of appearances there. But in truth we are quite unable to state how soon any of the disciples returned from Galilee to Jerusalem; the book of Acts is by no means sufficient authority for believing that they were gathered there as early as the day of Pentecost, fifty days after Jesus' death. For the book of Acts asserts that they did not leave Jerusalem at all; its witness to their presence there is no more

[1] *Cf.* Keim, pp. 533–535 (Eng. tr., pp. 281–284); Brandt, p. 316; Arnold Meyer, p. 114; Schmiedel, col. 4071.

[2] *Cf. supra*, pp. 383–386, also Clemen, p. 204, Arnold Meyer, p. 129.

valid as to the fiftieth day than as to the third.[1] The natural thing would be that these Galilean peasants and fishers should remain in their own neighbourhood, carrying on Jesus' work in precisely the environment where he had himself laboured. In Galilee, where the Master has friends and followers, where his person is known and his message familiar, we naturally expect his disciples to proclaim the wonderful attestation to the truth of his every utterance. Only after a somewhat extended period, when the disciples have become adjusted to the new situation, when they have come to realise what a responsibility is laid upon them, to what high commission the rest of their lives must be consecrated, only when the mission is organised with some definiteness, and the field of labour in some fashion apportioned among their number, do they begin the propaganda in the capital city. It is probably at least a period of months. During this time there is the rapid spreading of the great news among the people of Galilee who had heard Jesus with sympathy, there is the assembling of the five hundred brethren and their "vision," there is the conversion of James and doubtless of the rest of Jesus' family, there is propaganda of an ecstatic, swift sort, unorganised, without fixed plan or purpose, as the twelve disciples are growing into apostles. It is as Tacitus said; "repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat . . . per Judeam."[2] This "repression for the present" is simply the period of quiet succeeding Jesus' death, before the propaganda breaks into publicity again in Jerusalem and other centres.

[1] *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, p. 121.

[2] *Annals*, xv., 44. *Cf.* Weizsäker, p. 1. Martineau, p. 374.

The length of this period, while the disciples are collecting their forces and preparing for the continuance of their Master's work we cannot, then, define. Tertullian asserts that Jesus spent forty days with his disciples in Galilee, before his ascension; *i. e.*, he conceives the forty days of Acts i : 3 as spent in Galilee, despite Luke's plain statement to the contrary.[1] Just this statement seems not to occur elsewhere, and there is no evidence that the Gnostic lengthening of the period between resurrection and ascension to a year and a half[2] meant to assign this time to Galilee.

The truth no doubt is that this Galilean period was not sharply limited by a simultaneous migration of the entire apostolic group to Jerusalem, leaving Galilee wholly without leadership. There is no evidence whatever of the presence of the entire Eleven in Jerusalem at one time at any period. To be sure, the vague and often legendary narratives in the first half of the book of Acts assume that "the apostles," as a fixed group, are there, and have been there, since before Jesus' death. Even the persecution, which sets every one else fleeing (viii : 1) does not move them from the city. But this is not history; it is an assumption of the author. When it comes to concrete personalities,

[1] *Apologeticum*, ch. xxi. "Cum discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galileam, Judææ regionem, ad quadraginta [the Fulda MS. reads *quinquaginta*] dies egit docens eos quæ docerent."

[2] Eighteen months, according to Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i., 3 : 2, xxx., 14; 545 days, according to Ascensio Isaiæ ix : 16 (Ethiopic text). The opening words of Pistis Sophia refer to a period eleven years after the resurrection; another year elapses before the final ascension. So the Second Book of Jeu 43 counts twelve years. *Cf.* C. Schmidt in *T. U.*, vol. viii., 1892, *Heft* 1–2, pp. 196, 438–440, and Bauer, p. 266.

no one of the Eleven appears individually, as doing or saying anything whatever, except Peter "and John," his silent partner. Now just these two, *and no others*, Paul cites as being in Jerusalem in the year 52, when he goes up for the "apostolic council" (Gal. ii: 9). With them is James, Jesus' brother, not of the Eleven. So in Luke's account of this council (Acts xv), only these two men, Peter and James, are mentioned by name, or take any actual part in the proceedings. "The apostles and elders and the whole church" form only the silent and passive background for the picture.

As early as the year 38, on the occasion of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, he found Peter there, "but other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother. Now touching the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." (Gal. i : 19 f.). There is, therefore, no evidence that the entire Eleven settled in Jerusalem; the only positive evidence is for Peter and John, with no certain indication how much earlier than the year 38 they were to be found there. Speaking strictly, there is no good *evidence* for John before the year 52, and Paul's expression ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν (Gal. i : 18) might be used against the view that Peter had been in the city at the time of Paul's activity as a persecutor. But this would probably be to claim too much.

We may, however, be sure that some of the Eleven, perhaps most of them, continued to work in Galilee. Luke rightly feels that only an express command of their Master would cause them to abandon that field which had been closest to his own heart, and take up work elsewhere. It may not be without significance that eight of the Eleven disappear from history after

Jesus' death, precisely as Galilee does. Luke is unable to give even a single incident in the further activity of any save Peter "and John," and of James Zebedee he can record only that he was martyred, a martyrdom which Mark x : 39 shows a well-known element of the tradition. Do the eight disciples disappear because they remain in that part of the Christian mission-field over which, for Luke, a veil is drawn? It seems at least worth noting that Jesus' home and the scene of his mission disappears at the same time with the majority of his personal disciples. Whether or no this is more than a coincidence, we are not without positive record of the Galilean activity of disciples. Weizsäcker has pointed out the obvious relation of the discourse in Matthew x to this period; where Jesus' words cease to be instruction for the present situation and become prophecy for the future, where Matthew (in part paralleled by Luke) enlarges upon the simpler wording of Mark, especially in vss. 17–42, we have graphic pictures of the Galilean propaganda.[1] Verse 23, for example, "When they persecute you in this town, flee to the next; for verily I tell you you shall not finish the towns of Israel till the Son of Man be come," is the voice of the church, though not the voice of the same church which wrote xxviii : 19, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations." A more careful study of Matthew x and similar synoptic passages would undoubtedly make a needed contribution to our knowledge of the earliest church.

Here, however, it is important only to see clearly that the "appearances" of the risen Jesus came to the disciples in Galilee, who thereupon began the propa-

[1] Weizsäcker, pp. 24–27. *Cf.* Arnold Meyer, pp. 121 f.

ganda and there founded the Christian church, not in Jerusalem. One may not, of course, assert that no appearances came to the disciples or others at a later time, in the capital city also. Some scholars who place the earliest visions in Galilee, think that subsequent appearances in Jerusalem may have given basis for the "Jerusalem tradition" of Luke and John, more particularly for the Emmaus incident.[1] This is unlikely, if only for the reason that the origin of this form of the tradition is sufficiently obvious apart from such suggestion. In any case, it is very certain that none of the *recorded* appearances belong to Jerusalem.

[1] So Clemen, pp. 206 f.; Arnold Meyer, pp. 130, 134–136 (*cf.* p. 41); Lake, pp. 218 f. Korff, pp. 106–108, thinks the appearances to Peter and the Twelve were at Jerusalem, those to the 500, to James, to all the apostles (conceived as ἅπαξ) following in Galilee, after the disciples return thither. Schwartzkopf, pp. 113–115, argues also for Jerusalem as the scene of the earliest appearances. The mediæval harmonistic combination, which located Galilee on one of the peaks of the Mount of Olives, and so made a convenient grouping of sacred sites, no longer needs discussion. Argued in recent years by R. Hofmann, Resch, Lepsius, and others, this resolution of the contradiction between the "Galilean" and the "Jerusalem" traditions has received a final refutation at the hands of Theodor Zahn, in his article "Der Auferstandene Jesus in Galiläa," in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. xiv. (1903) pp. 770–808. *Cf.* also Arnold Meyer, pp. 95–101. The most recent attempt of Resch (*Das Galiläa bei Jerusalem*, 1910) to rehabilitate this theory, has in no wise altered the case.

CHAPTER XVI

JESUS THE MESSIAH

IN attempting finally a brief reconstruction of the original situation, we must first of all make clear to ourselves that antecedent to the experiences which attested Jesus' resurrection to his disciples was their faith in him and in his promise that he would rise from the dead on the third day. That such a conviction was his, and that he shared it with his disciples there is not only no reason to doubt, but every reason to believe, as the necessary corollary of the entire situation. Jesus believes that he shall rise from the dead because he believes he is to be Messiah. The two convictions are part of one great overmastering self-consciousness which we must understand if we are to understand Jesus at all. At a point in his ministry which we cannot determine with exactness he becomes convinced that in and through him God is to realise his Kingdom, and fulfil the prophetic dreams of centuries. The day and the hour when he shall be called to stand forth endowed with power from on high, as the anointed of God and agent of the divine will, he does not know. Just how he is to appear and begin his Messianic work he knows not, nor does he ask. He awaits his Father's good time, and meanwhile goes about doing good and telling the glad tidings of the Father-love, striving to

make men ready to receive the Kingdom when it shall come.

He is met with enmity by the leaders of his people's life. They hate him as an upstart and a destroyer of old sanctities; they hate him as the sworn foe of their religious and ecclesiastical *régime*. It becomes clear to him that their enmity will end ere long in his death; the alternative of giving up or of modifying his word does not so much as occur to him. But his firm faith in his destiny does not falter. God has chosen him to be Messiah, and God's plan shall not fail, despite all that men can do. His exaltation to Messianic power and the bringing in of the Kingdom he has up to this point, of course, expected within the limits of earth-life, before he should die, if he were at all to die. Now that death must be reckoned with as a near possibility, without a falter or a break in his sublime confidence he looks across the gulf and sees himself appearing as Messiah from a heavenly life beyond. Men may kill him, but God will not let him remain in death; his Father will raise him up from among the dead, grant him to anticipate the rest of the departed, that he may return to accomplish the task laid upon him. In the light of this conviction he reads the words of Daniel vii : 13 as having special reference to himself. He is to be the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven. Death must release its hold upon him; the third day shall see him risen, ready to return in glory.

As yet he has said no word of his own dream of his destiny to any living soul. It had not the slightest place in his public preaching; not even had he breathed it in secret to his disciples. But now it must be shared with the Twelve, not to be repeated by them, but only

under the charge of strictest secrecy. Jesus never means his own identity with Messiah to be proclaimed on earth; not till the clouds of heaven bear witness to the startled world is it to be known. The secret which he now shares with his disciples is his entire secret. Not only is their Master the Messiah-elect, but, harder still to hear, it is appointed that he is to suffer, and so to enter into his glory. The path by which Jesus the rabbi of Nazareth is to attain the glory of Messiah's throne leads through the valley of the shadow of death, through shame and agony, through Sheol itself, and then up, up, to the heavens and the right hand of the Majesty on high. Scarcely once does Jesus speak of his death without adding the conviction that robs death of all its victory, that he shall at once, "within three days," escape from the gates of the underworld to the life with God. Death and resurrection belong together, as inseparable parts of that process by which he is to pass from his present humble station to that eminence from which he shall come in glory.

Their Master's Messiahship, his certain death on earth, his resurrection on the third day, his fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy of the coming of the Son of Man, his parousia in glory, all this the disciples learn. During the last weeks of his life, Jesus seems to have done little else than to instil this series of ideas into the minds of his disciples, with frequent repetition and much explanation, in order that the catastrophe may not sweep them away and make shipwreck of their faith. It is his great concern to render their faith so deep and strong that it will survive the sharp testing of the tragedy that is coming—that when all his work

has ended in utter disaster, in defeat and death, they may still, in the succeeding days, believe in him as they now do, may love him, trust him, be confident that he has risen and is above in glory, may cherish the conviction that the kingdom is at hand and look confidently for Messiah's appearing, not as a figure strange and terrible, but as those who wait and watch for the coming of a familiar friend. No one knew so well as Jesus how weak were his disciples, and how overwhelming the coming catastrophe, how fierce its test. On Peter, keen, rash, intuitive, vacillating Peter, he builds his chief hope. "Simon, Simon, *I have prayed for thee*, that thy faith fail not!" If Simon's faith does not stand the shock, he may well despair of the rest; if Simon comes to himself when the shock is over, he may strengthen his brethren.

The sequel showed how wisely and well Jesus had laboured in those last days, and how thoroughly he knew the nature of Peter. The shock of the catastrophe proved indeed terrible. They all forsook him and fled, and most of all, after the traitor, did Peter seem to lose all faith and all manhood. But the lesson had sunk too deep into their souls to fail of its effect; ere many days had passed Jesus appeared to Peter, then to the Twelve. It was the strength of the impression made by the intercourse of those last weeks which made it possible for Peter to experience this vision of his risen Master and to renew his faith, this time beyond possibility of further faltering, and to spread the contagion of that renewed faith to his ten companions.

The promises of his resurrection spoken by Jesus during those weeks are given in somewhat stereotyped form by our evangelists. Before considering them in

any detail, two general remarks must be made. It is obvious, in the first place, that Jesus is here not saying anything whatever about the fate of his body after death. He is not claiming that his body, after he has been put to death, is going to be placed in a tomb, and on the third day is going to come to life, come out of the tomb and renew intercourse with his followers. Nothing of the sort is in his words; the common assumption that this is what he promised is simply a reading of the details of the subsequent stories of Matthew, Luke, and John back into his simple word: I shall rise again. The resurrection of which he here speaks is equivalent to ascension; it is his escape from Sheol, his passage to heaven.[1] It has absolutely no concern with grave or corpse, any allusion to which fails utterly in his words. Not only was no such meaning in his intent, no such meaning was for an instant attached to his words by the disciples who heard them, as the whole subsequent narrative makes clear. The recognition of this simple fact will at once remove a host of difficulties which loom large before every apologist.

In the second place, Jesus promised only that he would rise; he did not promise that, after his resurrection, he would appear to his disciples, or that they were to have any outward proof that he had risen. They must believe that because they believe him; it is an act of faith, a part of their faith in him. There is no particle of indication that Jesus expected, still less intended, to appear to his disciples after he had escaped from Sheol. Neither he or they thought to

[1] *Cf.* Maurenbrecher, pp. 55 f. "Einen anderen Sinn hat ja das Wort Auferstehung in bezug auf den Christus . . . niemals gehabt."

see each other again until the parousia. This consideration, like the preceding one, is the solution of a whole series of difficulties.[1]

Keeping these two considerations in mind, if we look at the passages in which Jesus promises his resurrection on the third day we shall find no reason to criticise their substance. To be sure, the evangelist, rendering into Greek the tradition of Jesus' Aramaic utterances, does not reproduce *verbatim* a remark made in privacy to the disciples, but that Jesus, in foretelling his death, foretold also his escape from that death "on the third day," is certain. The passages Mark x: 38, x: 45, xiv: 8, xiv: 21–25, xiv: 27–31, xiv: 34–42, with their parallels, show Jesus approaching the hour of his death with open eyes. The specific declarations of resurrection are given in Mark viii: 31, ix: 9–13, ix: 31, x: 33 f., with their parallels. There is no supernatural prevision here indicated. Such a phrase as "rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes" means only "condemned by the Sanhedrin," and that the leaders of Judaism were his enemies to the death had long been clear.[2] That Jesus spoke of his death as crucifixion does not appear in Mark; Matthew has inserted it in his parallel (xx: 18) to the passage where Mark also (x: 33 f.) shows clearest evidence of the addition of *ex eventu* details to the original saying. But there is nothing unlikely in the supposition that Jesus should expect his death to be by the cross; if carried out at all by legal process, it must be by the Romans, and crucifixion was the common form of execution for provincials and criminals not possessing Roman citi-

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 197 f. [2] *Cf. e.g.*, Mark iii: 6, iii: 22, vii: 1–6.

zenship.[1] In the pages of Josephus we see Jews crucified by thousands during Jesus' time. Why should he not have so spoken? With as much miraculous prevision would an aristocrat in France during the Revolution have expected death by the guillotine. Yet it is not certain that Jesus did so speak. Certain only is that he looked forward to death and speedy resurrection from death. The contention, perhaps most clearly expressed by Pfleiderer,[2] that Jesus neither expected nor predicted death, but went to Jerusalem hoping for an earthly Messianic triumph, not only rests on an arbitrary rejection of the gospel testimony, but renders the whole gospel story inexplicable.

More widely shared and at first sight more persuasive is the contention that Jesus cannot have so plainly predicted his resurrection on the third day as the gospels declare. The whole account of the behaviour of the disciples at the time of Jesus' death and immediately after, it is urged, shows that they cannot have expected him to rise from the dead on the Sunday, and that therefore he cannot have so foretold, at least with anything like the explicitness of the gospel passages. Either these gospel sayings are wholly *ex eventu* and unhistorical, or they originally had a different form and signified only "the speedy triumph of his cause,"

[1] *Cf.* Allen, *ad* Mat. x: 38 and xx: 19, and compare Mark viii: 34.

[2] O. Pfleiderer, "Jesus' Foreknowledge of His Sufferings and Death," in *New World*, Sept., 1899, pp. 431 ff. So, earlier, Holsten, pp. 150 ff., and others. *Cf.* Keim, vol. ii., 1871, pp. 554 f. (Eng. tr., vol. iv., pp. 271 f.). The critique of these predictions of Jesus, like so much modern criticism, was anticipated by Celsus. *Cf.* Origen, Contra Celsum, ii: 13–20, 44, 54 f.

or the like.[1] At Jesus' arrest the disciples forsake him and flee; none of them appears in the vicinity of the grave on the third day, as if having even a suspicion that the buried Master is to rise. The women go to anoint the body, they plainly do not expect that it is to rise; earlier, indeed, Nicodemus and Joseph have accomplished the anointing. When the grave is found empty, the women are amazed; their report to the disciples is met with incredulity. Even the appearances of Jesus meet at first this same incredulity, or provoke fear or consternation. No one betrays the least consciousness that what is happening is just what Jesus had repeatedly told them would happen, most recently only four days before. Luke xxiv: 25, "O foolish men,

[1] So, *e.g.*, Pfleiderer, in the article just cited and *Urchristentum*, pp. 359 f., 676 f.; Rohrbach, *Berichte*, p. 7; A. Reville, in *New World*, Sept., 1894, pp. 502, 513, and more briefly, J. de N., vol. ii., p. 214; Arnold Meyer, pp. 306, 308, 181 f.; Lake, pp. 256–259; Maurenbrecher, p. 118 f. The English reader will find a very full demonstration of the case against these predictions (taken as implying bodily resurrection) in the anonymous book *The Four Gospels as Historical Records*, 1895, pp. 367–370. The general view goes back to Reimarus, and is fully developed by Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 1st ed., vol. ii., 1836, pp. 324–341. For the genuineness of the utterances, *cf.* Keim, vol. ii., 1871, pp. 555–558 (Eng. tr., vol. iv., pp. 268–274); O. Holtzmann, p. 388; von Dobschütz, p. 13; Korff, pp. 232–234.

Schwartzkopf, in his book dealing with these prophecies, argues for their genuineness, but thinks Jesus expected to pass into Heaven immediately after death, and used the three days figuratively of the brief time to elapse before the parousia. Holtzmann: *N. T. Theol.*, vol. i., pp. 305–309, thinks the three-day reference *ex eventu*, and gives further references to literature. Schmiedel, col. 4067, thinks that Jesus "may very well, at one time or another, have expressed himself in some such sense." It is possible to be more definite.

and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken!" is justly quoted as indicating that the disciples might have known from prophecy, but not from Jesus' own words, what was to come to pass.

We have already seen that many of these incidents are unhistorical, but there remains at least the complete despair and dispersion of the disciples, and their return to their Galilean homes without a thought of tarrying to see whether their Master might not come to life on the Sunday. It is absolutely clear, from every point of view, that they were not expecting any such event, any further phenomenon connected with the body and the grave. But it is equally clear that they had no reason to expect any such phenomenon, that nothing in Jesus' predictions had been meant by him, or understood by them, as promising anything which had to do with body or grave, which could be apprehended by ear or eye, which had spacial relations to Jerusalem or any spot of earth. What he had promised was a phenomenon entirely withdrawn from the sphere of sense, a transaction behind the veil.[1] The behaviour of the disciples is therefore perfectly natural. As a matter of fact, any declaration by Jesus that his *body* would rise from its tomb on the third day, or any such expectation on the part of the disciples or others, is rendered entirely impossible by the consideration that such expectation necessarily assumes the *burial* of his body. But burial was precisely the one thing which could not have been foreseen or taken

[1] *Cf.* McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, Revised Ed., 1900, p. 37, note 2. The point is rarely clearly recognised by exegetes, though definitely set forth by H. H. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, part ii., 1890, pp. 542–544. (Eng. tr., vol. ii., 1892, pp. 266–268).

for granted, which was of all things most unlikely. For the bodies of the crucified were commonly left upon the cross, or, at best, thrown into a common pit. That Jesus' body found burial was an unusual piece of fortune, dependent on the combination of two incalculable factors, the piety (and courage) of Joseph of Arimathea and the clemency of Pilate. Had Jesus meant that his body would rise from burial, he must have charged the disciples to take care that it found burial; had they expected such rising, they must of their own initiative have provided the burial. It is noteworthy that in Jesus' predictions of his resurrection there is no slightest allusion to burial or the grave,[1] not even in Mark x: 33 f. and parallels, where details have most *ex eventu* amplification. In every case the reference to rising follows directly upon that to dying. It is always resurrection from death, never from the grave.[2]

The evangelists, indeed, since they conceive of the resurrection as concerning the buried body, conceive Jesus' promises of resurrection as having the same reference, though no one of them puts into his words this reference, as they might so easily have done quite without consciousness of having changed Jesus' original intent.[3] They are therefore confronted by the same dilemma which meets modern critics: How could the

[1] The word in Mark xiv: 8, of the anointing of his body beforehand *εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν*, is Jesus' only allusion to his burial. Here it has no connection with resurrection.

[2] On Jesus' own idea of his resurrection, *cf.* Schweitzer, pp. 361–363.

[3] This is conclusive evidence that the "predictions" are authentic, not *ex eventu* constructions.

disciples have heard these plain predictions and yet have so utterly ignored them in their subsequent action? The evangelists' answer is characteristic and simple. The disciples did not understand; there was some strange torpor over their understandings when this matter was spoken of, so that it made no impression on their minds. Only later, after the resurrection had been attested by the "appearances," did they recall these plain predictions of the Master. This *motif* is most clearly developed in Luke (*cf.* ix: 45, xviii: 34, xxiv: 6 f., 16). As we have seen, it is one of his chief apologetic elements, but the other evangelists share it in their degree.[1] It ought not to be necessary to point out that this is in no sense history, but only apologetic dogma, that no disciples, no human beings, were ever actually the victims of such extraordinary psychological vagaries. The notion may be pardoned to the evangelists, less easily so to modern scholars. Yet most present-day apologetes and some of the more critical investigators adopt this explanation of the evangelists. The reason is simply that if the empty grave is accepted as historical, and Jesus and his earliest followers are conceived as contemplating a resurrection having to do with the buried body, the only alternatives are to declare Jesus' predictions of resurrection unhistorical or to make the disciples into the most extraordinarily stupid and forgetful of mortals. The former procedure is perhaps the more common among critical scholars, but the latter is very frequent.[2]

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 321–323, and add to the references there given Mark ix: 10, 32.

[2] So, *e.g.*, Edersheim, vol. ii., p. 624; Korff, p. 19.

Closely related to this element of the narrative is the statement of the bewilderment and terror that fell upon the first recipients of the experiences attesting Jesus' resurrection. So the women (Mark xvi: 5, 8) are amazed at the angel and his message; trembling and astonishment came upon them. In Mat. xxviii: 5, 8 they fear, so in Luke xxiv: 5, while in Luke xxiv: 37, 41 the disciples are terrified and affrighted and suppose that they are seeing a spirit ("a ghost"); they disbelieve for joy, and wonder. As a matter of fact, this is precisely what must have happened when to Peter and to the others came suddenly, unexpectedly, the "appearances" of their dead Master, which he had never by so much as a word predicted. Of course they were at first terrified and affrighted, and thought they saw a ghost, though in a moment their fear turns to a great joy and an unshakable faith. In truth the τρόμος and ἔκστασις of Mark xvi: 8 are much better words to describe the disciples' first emotions than the πτοηθέντες καὶ ἔμφοβοι of Luke xxiv: 37. Where these emotions are attributed to the women it is simply the literary transference to them of what really was felt by the disciples. The women, who see only a young man in white, who repeats to them Jesus' own promise, have no ground for "trembling and ecstasy," which are not the same, it should be noted, with the φόβος of ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. That was fear of consequences.

To his disciples, then, Jesus entrusts his secret, his assurance that he is to be Messiah, but must reach his throne of power by way of the cross and the underworld, from which, on the third day, he should escape, victorious, to the heavenly places. His disciples hear, and understand, and believe; or rather, they cannot

quite believe that God will let his Messiah suffer shame and death. Every day they look to see another aspect of things begin to replace these gloomy forebodings, theirs is not yet their Master's faith in the *Via Dolorosa* as the divinely appointed path to Messiah's glory. "Be it far from thee, Master; this shall never be to thee" (Mat. xvi: 22). "They supposed that the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear" (Luke xix: 11). They go with Jesus to Jerusalem to the great feast; the triumphal entry into the city, when the Master is hailed by a jubilant crowd as the prophet who comes in Jahweh's name, the herald of the Kingdom,[1] only feeds their hopes. But the following days are undecisive; no Messianic claim is made, and the crisis is all too plainly drawing near. Judas's wavering faith in his Master's destiny cannot stand the test; his traitor-voice breaks the command that they should tell no man that Jesus is Messiah, and makes immediate and sure the fate his Master had foretold. No longer need the Sanhedrists put skilfully devised catch-questions to Jesus, or send out spies, "that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor" (Luke xx: 20). They have a valid accusation, which will bring without delay his condemnation and execution by the Roman power. On the night before Passover Jesus is seized by a band of men sent out by the Sanhedrists and led away a prisoner. The swift and complete triumph of the enemy carries the eleven disciples away in sudden panic. They all forsake him and flee, and while they are cowering in terrified concealment about

[1] *Not* as Messiah, as the account of Mark and the whole course of events makes certain.

the city, Peter sick with shame and self-abasement, the Messiah is done to death. None of his own are by him; only certain women are beholding from afar. By mid-afternoon Jesus has breathed his last; before sunset Joseph has laid him in a hasty grave. The good councillor, having done his pious duty, passes out of history. The body lies where he has placed it, until time and nature have done their work. Years pass, and war devastates the site; body and grave alike are dust.

But what of the disciples? In fear and despair, in grief and shame, they flee when the holy day is past, to their old homes in Galilee, to their old labours by the sea. Their courage and faith are sadly shattered. To be sure, Jesus had told them before it came to pass, but they were not able to face his prediction squarely, for their obstinate hope that the glory of the Messianic appearance would anticipate the death all signs foreboded. Their faith is not fully gone, indeed. They could recall the Master's promise that he would rise, but how are they to be sure he has done so? He *may* have risen from the dead, he *may* be even now above in the heavenly world, but they have no assurance of it, save their apparently unjustified faith in *him*, to which they desperately cling. They have but to wait as hopefully as they may, and see if he returns to resume his interrupted work. In this frame of mind the old Galilean life is taken up, and if nothing more had happened, their faith and hope would not have long survived, and the Christian movement would have died at birth.[1]

But something further happened. It is the declaration of Paul's gospel-message: "He appeared to Cephas,

[1] See this strongly put by Keim, p. 605 (Eng. tr., p. 364).

then to the Twelve." The first effect of these appearances upon their recipients was sheer amazement and even terror, a wonder and a solemn fear. For he had only foretold that he would rise, not that he would appear. But when he burst through the veil, and they saw before them him who had perished on the cross in Jerusalem, thus giving them gratuitous and certain proof of the truth of what he had claimed as to his resurrection and his future Messianic career—then trembling and awe indeed fell on them. We cannot picture too solemnly such a scene. Until this attestation came, their faith might indeed waver; they had only his bare word to rely on, and he was dead, lost to sight and sense. To keep faith, in the face of the dark reality, was hard; their despondency and "stumbling" are understandable. And into this mood came suddenly, unprepared-for, like a lightning-flash, the "appearances." Their importance cannot easily be overstated; they meant the supreme and certain attestation of all that Jesus had ever claimed and the assurance of fulfilment for every hope associated with his name. Even if the disciples could have believed that Jesus was risen and living in the heavenly world above, yet surely without the proof offered by the "appearances," their proclamation of the fact and of all the momentous consequences that hung upon it, would have made little impression on the world. We can understand the central place the preaching of the resurrection occupies in all the early missionary proclamation, and can divine what a power it was in the propaganda. Any complete concordance, under the word "resurrection," will give us impressive data here. But we must never forget the wholly gratuitous char-

acter of these appearances; they were never promised and were surely as unexpected by the living Jesus as by those to whom they came. And the fact that the disciples' first feeling of amazement and terror was immediately swallowed up in the glad faith that their dear Master is alive forevermore, their heavenly friend and God's Messiah, is "the perfect tribute" to the marvellous impression his living personality had made on them.

This is, after all, the great miracle, the impress of Jesus' personality on his disciples. It was so deep and strong, in a word, that they saw him after he had died. This is the real secret of the "appearances." Whatever psychology may have to say here,[1] it is clear that without this tremendous personal impression in the souls of these eleven men Jesus would not, could not, have appeared. That these eleven saw him after his death, and that the twelfth, in despair, hanged himself, is a powerful witness to the strength of that impression.[2] The impression itself was, indeed, not consciously received by the disciples at the time of their intercourse with Jesus; only in the after days did it begin to exercise its full power upon them.[3] But it made the "appearances" possible; it made possible for them the faith that he could not be holden of death, that in him the Psalm-word had come true: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." Him they could believe when he said: "In three days I shall rise again." Another, let

[1] *Cf. supra*, pp. 55–57.

[2] *Cf.* William Mackintosh, *Natural History of the Christian Religion*, 1894, p. 282.

[3] Brandt, p. 494, carries this much too far.

us say John the Baptist, they would not have believed had he made this great claim never so confidently and forcibly, nor would visions of such another have come to lighten the disciples' hour of gloom. Jesus had impressed himself upon them more powerfully and deeply than they themselves knew, so deeply that after temporary desertion of him, loss of faith, despair, that impression could reassert itself so strongly as to give them absolute assurance of his present life, even give them sight of him in his glorious body; so powerfully as to cause their spirits to spring elastic into a faith and assurance and devotion far surpassing anything they had known while he was with them in the flesh. His present glorious life becomes more real, more influential, more near and dear, than all their days and weeks with him in Galilee. Now does Peter's boast become earnest: "If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all," vowing to their risen Master undivided service and loyalty unto death.[1]

All criticism, all study, must bring out in ever stronger relief this great witness to the supreme personality of Jesus. For a man by his gifts of soul, by *what he was*, to produce this great conviction of his immediate victory over death, how much grander and truer a thing is this than a conviction based on the crude material sensible evidences of a corpse revived, of wounded hands and feet that are touched and felt, of a body that eats and drinks and walks and talks. Because thou hast seen hast thou believed? Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign, and there

[1] *Cf.* Wernle, p. 82.

shall no sign be given to it save the sign of Jonah the prophet. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, for they repented at the *preaching* of Jonah, and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.

APPENDIX

WHAT IS FAITH IN THE RESURRECTION?

[An Address Given September 24, 1908, at the Opening of the Sixty-fifth Year of the Meadville Theological School.][1]

"I BELIEVE in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried. The third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty." It is about these statements of the Apostles' Creed that the conflict between certain two schools of historical study rages with least apparent prospect of peace. For the combatants are not on the same field; one party fights as it were in the air, the other on the solid ground, and the blows of each doughty warrior entirely miss his antagonist. On the one hand, alleged facts of history, events which either did or did not happen, at a certain time of day and in a certain geographical location, which you or I could have seen or apprehended by our normal senses had we been in that place at that time, are made the subject of faith and of dogmatic assertion. They are to be believed as dogmatic dicta, independently of historical investigation. Of course it

[1] Reprinted from the *Quarterly Bulletin* of the School, vol. iv., No. 2.

is held by this school that historic research, were no obstacles in its path, would fully demonstrate the actual occurrence of the alleged facts; but historic research can never fully penetrate into these remote events, and the ordinary believer has neither time nor capability to pursue it, were its results never so sure. The Church's way is simpler: to be absolutely independent of all historic proof; in short, to transplant these stated happenings from the field of history to that of dogma. Faith, not history, is to tell us what events were transpiring in one or another Palestinian town on a certain day of a certain year of the first century; history can say what was going on in Rome or Athens or Alexandria that same day and hour. As to the half-dozen Palestinian happenings in question, history is denied the right to speak, that is, to speak the deciding word. Where her testimony reiterates the statement of faith, she is indeed gladly heard, but the word of faith becomes no stronger thereby. It rests secure above the fear of history's gainsaying or the need of history's attestation.

It is easy for the antagonists of this view to see its surpassing error, but in combating it they are often like one beating the air. And not infrequently, blinded by excess of zeal, they insensibly fall into the same error, not only calling upon history for a certainty in these matters which it can never give, but fain to establish the truth or error of certain properly dogmatic statements by the application of historic criteria. The two points of view are seldom kept sufficiently distinct; certainly in the creedal passage above, statements properly historic are curiously mingled with others properly dogmatic, yet they all commonly receive the

same treatment, devoutly asserted together as the faith of the worshipper, and by scholars maintained or refuted alike by the dogmatic method or the historic.

The physiological conditions attending the birth of any human child are matters of history and experience; and even though history does not have explicit or reliable data in respect to a certain given case, yet faith is in no conceivable instance justified in asserting, independently of history, conditions that contradict general human experience. It may, indeed, be urged that in the specific case of Jesus' birth, the assertion that human paternity was lacking is not independent of history, but is the statement made by the only histories of the event known to us, the accounts of Matthew and Luke. And yet any one who is familiar with the apologetic of the present day knows that the virgin birth is less and less defended by appeal to the integrity and infallibility of the gospel record, more and more from dogmatic and theological considerations that thus and no otherwise it behooved the Son of God to enter the world. This change of emphasis is well expressed by Dr. Charles A. Briggs.[1] "When you begin with a divine person and ask how that divine person was to become man and be conceived in the womb of a woman, biology has no information whatever to give us.* * * It is a mystery of dogmatic fact, for which we require sufficient evidence. That evidence is given by those best qualified to know, in the gospels; and it is sustained by the proprieties of the case, *for it is evident that in no other way than by the con-*

[1] "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord." *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1908, p. 204.

ception by a virgin could God become really incarnate."[1] Clearly the "sufficient evidence" of the gospels would not be sufficient to establish the fact for Dr. Briggs, unsustained by dogmatic propriety. I suppose no one would now seriously urge that, apart from dogmatic considerations, we have in Matthew and Luke historical evidence sufficient in quantity and cogency, or sufficiently well authenticated, to prove the stupendous miracle in question. Where one believes that Jesus had no father simply because Matthew and Luke say so, we have, of course, properly speaking, not faith in the Virgin Birth at all, but only faith in Biblical infallibility. And this, in turn, is dogma, independent of history.

Again, history may fix the name of the Roman official set over a particular district at a particular time, may demonstrate the fact and manner of a certain criminal execution, with the death and burial of the victim; but surely with these things as historic happenings faith has nothing to do. History is free to affirm or to deny their occurrence according to its own laws. Faith may, with entire propriety, concern herself with the *interpretation* or *religious evaluation* of these facts, with their relation to God and to the souls of men—in short, with such of their aspects or elements as lie outside the field of sensible historic occurrence. But with their occurrence or non-occurrence she has no more concern than with the battle of Waterloo.

The experiences of the human soul after death are,

[1] Italics mine. *Cf.* also the papers appended to Professor Orr's "Virgin Birth of Our Lord," 1907, most of which evince the same emphasis, though building, of course, on the gospel records.

again, proper subjects of faith. It is true that many who have applied themselves to one or another form of psychic research hope to throw open to us the world beyond bodily death, and make its experiences matters of history and sensible perception, even as those of our present life; but as yet what lies beyond must be regarded as a bourne from which no traveller returns, whose entire content transcends our historic knowledge. Faith, then, can predicate of one soul, or of all souls, a rising out of death on the third day, or at any point of time which has a value for faith, a transition into heaven, a union with God. Heaven itself, and God, are objects of faith, not of historic or sensible perception; and the fixing of the relations of the soul to them lies within the full right of that same faith.

If this is what the creed means by its assertion concerning Jesus, "the third day he rose again from the dead," it is a legitimate confession of faith, and the historian has no right of question. But the church has always insisted, since the creed was formulated, that this is *not* what is meant; that the statement is no confession of faith at all, but a narration of certain happenings on the outskirts of the city of Jerusalem at certain hours of certain days in the spring of the year 30 of our era, happenings attested in the normal manner to the senses of certain men and women who were present. So, very explicitly, the late syllabus *Lamentabili Sane Exitu*, Sections 36 and 37. This contention that we have here no confession of faith, but a bit of historic narrative, is properly a contention that the statements have no place at all in a creed, but this the church has never been willing to see. I repeat, it is the church that has insisted that the

"resurrection" spoken of by the creed is not the spiritual experience of which faith has the exclusive right to speak, but an external, visible, audible, localised and dated event of history. The church thereby, however strenuously she may deny it, gives to history full right to apply its criteria and promises to abide by its decision. Despite her disclaimers, she deliberately leaves to history the answering of the question: is the resurrection a reality? avowing herself content to receive from a source outside herself her certainty on this cardinal point. To be sure she is not thus content. She does, as a matter of fact, involve herself in a complete contradiction, insisting that what she has just declared to be an event of history shall be accepted by faith, and refusing to hear history's answer to her question unless that answer but repeat the conviction she has already reached by processes other than those of history. Logically the church should confess: if historical investigation answers *no* concerning the occurrence of the external event, then is Christ not risen and our faith is vain.

The confusion of objects of faith with objects of sense leads to this fundamental mistake of method, but more fatal are the results incurred by putting in such jeopardy the precious conviction of our own resurrection, which, again, the church makes absolutely dependent on the reality of this one test case. We might here lift the curtain on the tragedy of many souls. The insistence of the church that the creed is dealing with an event in the history of the first century A.D. has forced no small number of devout men and women, very properly attempting to fix the actuality of this event by the criteria of external history, to renounce

the faith. It is the church that has thus forced them to the conviction: there is no resurrection, and has not infrequently made them of all men most miserable.

That amazing piece of sensational fiction *When It Was Dark* has just come in my way. It would not deserve mention save that it bears upon its cover a commendation in the words of "the Bishop of London, preaching at Westminster Abbey," words which in the extremest fashion urge that the resurrection is not a matter of faith, but of history, and so properly liable to the contingencies of historic demonstration.[1] The church could choose no more effective or rapid way than this to destroy among her people faith in the resurrection. For every one influenced by such a publication to accept its author's belief, a hundred are convinced by every public school, college, and university, by every newspaper and review, by every work of science or of history, that phenomena such as the reviving of a corpse, its subsequent activity and exhibition of miraculous irreconcilable properties, do not belong to the sober record of facts. And further, in so far as these hundred think, they are being convinced that even if these phenomena could be demonstrated as having actually occurred, they have no bearing on faith. They can prove nothing worth proving. Faith has the same concern with them *as happenings*, as

[1] *Cf.* also Morgan Dix, in the *Homiletic Review*, April, 1909, p. 310. Similarly Professor Edouard Güder of Bern (*Die Tatsächlichkeit der Auferstehung Christi*, Bern, 1862, pp. 7 f.) urged that the resurrection is not an article of the church's faith, any more than is the battle of Laupen. Not: I believe he rose, but: It is a fact that he rose, as it is a fact that Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo.

with events in the history of Mohammed or of Luther.[1]

The apologists do not commonly ask themselves with sufficient definiteness just what depends on the positions they are so strenuously maintaining. Much more of their zeal than they realise is due to the persistence of the impetus of the apologetic of a generation ago, whose chief effort was expended on the defence of the Bible as an inerrant book, rather than on that of the individual doctrines the book was supposed to teach. Now that, theoretically at any rate, "because the Bible says so" is becoming less sufficient a reason for believing one or another doctrine, and the doctrines themselves, in their inner and outer relations, are the real topics of discussion, we need to be sure, not only on what basis we believe, but for what purpose we believe. Suppose Jesus' body was revived, and the other events happened as the gospels variously relate; what of it? What consequences have these strange phenomena on our faith in Jesus' spiritual supremacy or in the immortality of the soul? If one is not concerned with the inerrancy of the record, why attempt to prove the phenomena at all? Why are they precious? What does the bodily resurrection with its accompanying physical marvels prove that is not otherwise abundantly proven? Without raising

[1] On the differentiation of facts of history from objects of faith, with particular reference to the resurrection, *cf.* Schwartzkopff, pp. 134 f., Steude's *Einleitung*, Edmond Stapfer: *Jesus Christ*, Eng. tr., 1898, vol. ii., p. 94 (quotation from Lachelier), and vol. iii., chap. 15, and especially P. Lobstein: "Der Evangelische Heilsglaube an die Auferstehung Jesu Christi" (*Zeitschrift für Theol. und Kirche*, vol. ii., 1892), pp. 343-368, esp. 358-368.

the question as to the possibility or probability of the phenomena, it is worth while to face clearly this question of their *value*. If "the resurrection" be this external wonder alone, or this external wonder chiefly, is it not largely robbed of its value? The reanimation of a dead body by the soul that formerly inhabited it is no unique phenomenon in the Biblical narrative. What evidential value has it in the case of Jesus that it lacks everywhere else? That souls do not become extinct at death but persist and may be recalled to their earthly tenements are important facts if true, and any evidence going to prove them is most important, but does Jesus' reanimation prove them more than Lazarus', *e. g.*, or that of the widow's son in Zarephath? It is instructive as well as interesting to see how the equivalent of this objection is met by so eminent a scholar as Dr. Edward Robinson.[1] He first censures the objection as bearing "the character of a speculative conclusion set over against the clear and express testimony of those who were appointed to be eye-witnesses of the facts. The true method in such cases is, first, to make ourselves acquainted with the facts; and then, if difficulties arise in our minds, to find such explanations of the facts as may, if possible, obviate these difficulties." And then, in order to give to Jesus' resurrection a unique significance and value, superior, *e. g.*, to that of Lazarus, he proceeds to include in the term's meaning "the glorious concomitants and consequences of that great fact, his ascension to Heaven and his exaltation at the right hand of God." If one must resort to these concomitants to carry the *values* of the

[1] "The Nature of Our Lord's Resurrection Body." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, May, 1845. Citation from pp. 305–308.

resurrection, the bodily phenomena are deprived of that significance Dr. Robinson is labouring to give them. He seems himself to feel a certain inadequacy in his argument, for he closes it with another rebuke to the objector. "It seems to me that it belongs not to us to sit in judgment upon the wisdom of the divine counsels; and then, because of the darkness of our own minds, to call in question what we cannot comprehend."

In similar fashion, consciously or unconsciously, every defender of the physical resurrection is forced to add to his definition some such concomitants and consequences in order to give to the resurrection the significance and uniqueness which he claims for it. Dr. Robinson was arguing that the risen body was the flesh and blood body that had been buried, without change, hence his "concomitants" must be the great factors of ascension and exaltation. Others, as Westcott and Milligan, do not go so far afield from their original definition, but argue that Jesus' body was by the resurrection process transformed into the glorified "spiritual body," and this *difference in his body* after the third day becomes the concomitant which carries the unique values of his resurrection. Olshausen[1] expresses this point of view with admirable clarity: "This significance of the resurrection appears only when we hold that the Saviour did not rise again with the *mortal* body which he bore before his crucifixion. Should we think, like many well-meaning persons, that

[1] Hermann Olshausen: *Biblical Commentary on the N. T.*, Eng. trans. by A. C. Kendrick, N. Y., 1857, vol. iii., p. 109. (*Biblischer Commentar über sämmtliche Schriften des N. T.*, Zweiter Band, dritte Auflage, 1838, pp. 548 f.)

the Saviour, when truly dead, was again quickened by an act of divine omnipotence, without any transformation having taken place in his body, we fail to see in what the importance of this fact consists. The raising of Lazarus would in that case have been a precisely similar event." In other words, it is impossible to attach the values of the resurrection to its definition as physical reanimation.

Again, we assert the resurrection from the dead as our sure hope for all believers, ourselves included. Yet the bodies of us all shall remain in the grave more than three days, and we neither expect nor desire a quickening of our mortal bodies. Modern apologetic sets a complete gulf between Jesus' resurrection and ours, making the two absolutely different in kind. New Testament apologetic was consistent here. A writer who conceived a non-physical future for believers, conceived also the Lord's resurrection in non-physical terms, while those who depict the quickening of his buried body, expected also the resurrection of their flesh from the grave. To-day we know, as surely as we know anything, that the lifeless clay disintegrates into its elements, and has no connection with our risen life. Must it have had necessary connection with his? Does "resurrection" when used of Jesus denote a phenomenon entirely different from that denoted by the same word when used of others? And just in proportion as Jesus' resurrection is made unique, is it not robbed of its value?[1] Dr. Milligan[2] uses this consideration very interestingly to support his contention that

[1] So Hermann Lotze: *Mikrokosmos*, 4th ed., vol. iii., 1888, pp. 365 f. (Eng. tr., vol. ii., 1885, p. 480).

[2] Milligan, pp. 18-22.

Jesus' resurrection-body was already glorified. "Our Lord's resurrection is the type and model of our own. * * * Whatever is told us of our own destiny must have had its analogy in Him. * * * To think that at any future time or in any future circumstances our body may be one thing, while our Lord's body was, in the same circumstances, a different thing, would be to deprive the Incarnation of its meaning." But our "spiritual bodies" must be compatible with the disintegration of our physical bodies; Jesus' (on Dr. Milligan's theory) was not. And does Dr. Milligan expect for us all in the heavenly world bodies of "flesh and bone," that can eat and drink—bodies, in short, such as Luke and John ascribe to the risen Jesus?[1] There is confusion of thought here. While on the one hand, in order to insure value to Jesus' physical resurrection, it is necessary to secure its uniqueness by adding certain concomitant characteristics, on the other hand the very uniqueness thus secured is fatal to the value it would guarantee. Kirsopp Lake[2] puts it succinctly: "The empty tomb is for us doctrinally indefensible." At any rate, we need to be told more clearly just wherein lies the value and significance of the physical definition of resurrection when used of Jesus, and why it is so ardently defended—except it be to maintain the inerrancy of the Scriptural narrative.

[1] It may be noted that it is these two elements—the phrase "flesh and bone," used by Jesus, and the account of his eating—that are Dr. Milligan's chief stumbling-blocks. Compare his "frankly irrational" (Canon Henson) note 6 on the former, and his despairing note 4 on the latter. "I neither know nor can offer any satisfactory solution of this act of our Lord's eating."

[2] Lake, p. 253.

Surely it is clear that the real resurrection, the real event which has meaning and importance for the soul's life, is the rising of Jesus out of death into the spiritual life with God. It is, in the vocabulary of the ancients, the passage from Hades to Heaven. Here we see that, granting the reanimation of the body, it is not yet fully *resurrection* until that body has gone up into the skies. It is an error in method, even on the traditional basis, to consider the resurrection apart from the ascension; the process would halt midway, incomplete. The true message of Easter is that Jesus passed out of death into life. That his spirit, as it were in passing, stopped to reanimate the discarded body for a period of days, must be, from any point of view, a secondary and unessential feature. History may pronounce as it will on this phenomenon of the reanimated body; it can have nothing to say, affirmatively or negatively, as to the essential resurrection. And in the latter lie all the values of faith, all that makes the word resurrection precious, indeed all the word's true meaning.

It is difficult to see how a contrary opinion can be maintained, or how the reanimated body can be regarded as an essential part of the definition of the word. All the values attributable to the physical reanimation episode must be, in one form or another, merely *evidential;* all the incidents of that episode simply ways of proving to dull hearts that the *real* resurrection has occurred.[1] This episode is, then, secondary; it is not *the* resurrection, not an element necessary to the complete definition of resurrection, not, strictly speaking, part of the resurrection at all, but an addendum, as it

[1] This is clearly recognised and urged by Robinson: *Bibliotheca Sacra*, May, 1845, p. 308 f.

were, something performed by Jesus after his resurrection, and in addition to it. Even the evangelists do not justify popular theology in defining the resurrection as the "coming to life" of Jesus' body and its emergence from the tomb. It is notable that the latter phenomenon is never described or distinctly asserted in the New Testament, being sometimes curiously evaded (as in Matthew xxviii: 2-5).

The evangelists' presentation is everywhere confused, composite, but it is easy to see that for them too the real resurrection is the escape of the Master's great soul from death into the heavenly life. "He is alive! Thou didst not leave his soul in Hades!" is the heart of what they mean. To this simpler faith they had of course to adjust the tradition of external events attesting its truth, but there can be no question as to what was the ultimate fact they were zealous to prove. The same thing is even more true, of course, of the disciples themselves; they distinguished clearly between the real fact about Jesus' continued life and the experiences which attested that fact to them.

It will be urged, to be sure, that conservative Christian apologetic also clearly makes this distinction, and does not mean to say that the resurrection was the "coming to life" of Jesus' body *and nothing more.* And yet one has only to read any one of the frequent discussions from the apologetic side to see that this is, after all, the substance of what is meant. The polemic against those who "deny our Lord's resurrection" is merely against those who deny or doubt the reanimation of the body and its subsequent activity. To believe with all one's heart and soul in what I have called above the real resurrection does not make one the

whit less a "denier" in the estimation of these writers. The thesis they one and all defend is that the body actually came from the grave, with the accompanying physical phenomena. The arguments they answer are arguments directed against these elements, not against the actual resurrection or against the spiritual experiences of the disciples which attested to them a spiritual fact. Admirably typical of the apologetic I am describing is the work recently published by Professor James Orr[1] of Glasgow. Everywhere it exhibits this practical identification of the "resurrection" with the episode of the revived body. Even more explicit is Principal Fairbairn[2] of Mansfield College, who writes: "If Christ be not risen our faith is vain. If it be proved that no living Christ ever issued from the tomb of Joseph, then that tomb becomes the grave, not of a man but of a religion." Plainly Dr. Fairbairn means this sentence of his to be equivalent in content to St. Paul's. So John Kennedy,[3] in one of the most vigorous and impassioned defences of the traditional position, gives at the outset this clear definition: "By the resurrection of Jesus Christ we mean * * * that the body which was taken down from the cross lifeless, and was laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, was restored to life. * * * It is of this material or bodily rising again that we say: it is an historical fact."

It would greatly tend to clarity if all writers on the subject would thus distinctly state just what is the "resurrection" they are to discuss. As a rule they do

[1] James Orr: *The Resurrection of Jesus*, 1908.

[2] A. M. Fairbairn: *Studies in the Life of Christ*, 1899, p. 332.

[3] John Kennedy: *The Resurrection of Jesus an Historical Fact*, 1895, pp. 9, 11.

not, but the matter they actually discuss is the physical phenomenon of the revived body. Of recent writers, the one who has most clearly seen and emphasised this distinction between the two definitions of the word "resurrection," is Canon Henson.[1] Let me quote his words at some length: "Is the resurrection of Christ a fact of history? The answer will be perhaps 'Yes' or 'No' according to the definition of 'resurrection, which we accept. That Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, survived death in no impoverished ghostly state, but in the fulness of personal life, enfranchised from terrestrial limitations, and that he made his presence known to his disciples by convincing evidences, cannot successfully be disputed. Christianity itself attests with ever-increasing authority the resurrection of the Divine Founder, whose personal influence within the church has been continuously shown by many infallible proofs, and is being shown still in the experience of believers. It needs but to read the New Testament in order to see that the fact of Christ's resurrection dominated the whole horizon of the earliest Christian church. It is implied in all the original institutions of the Christian society—the Apostolic Ministry, the Sacraments, the Lord's Day. It has remained the core of the Christian religion ever since, and never more apparently than at the present time. No language could be excessive to describe the

[1] H. Hensley Henson: "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ." *Hibbert Journal*, vol. ii., p. 476. Citation from p. 483. This thoughtful and courageous article is a notable exception to what I have said above about the confused position of the church towards faith and history as grounds of belief in the creedal articles.

importance of this conviction, that Christ is living in the fulness of personal life. Now history can give to that conviction all the support which the nature of the case permits; it can certify the primitiveness, universality, and moral force of the Christian belief. It can trace the effects in a hundred directions on the life, literature, and institutions of mankind. Beyond that it cannot advance. Must more be insisted on in the interests of the Christian religion? Is more really needed in order that Christians in the future as in the past may hold fast to the truth of Christ's resurrection?"

It is clear that Canon Henson, according to his own definition, earnestly holds fast to the truth of Christ's resurrection, but it is equally clear that, according to the definition which dominates Dr. Orr's book, for example, he is an unbeliever in the resurrection. The one man pleads for the recognition of a spiritual fact, the other for the recognition of a material fact. The "resurrection" of Canon Henson's faith is proved, so far as it is susceptible of proof, by the testimony of faith and Christian experience. "The resurrection" of Dr. Orr's treatment is to be proved, if at all, by the testimony of half a dozen discrepant documents, none by eye-witnesses and all written years after the alleged events. But in Canon Henson's sense, all the proofs urged by Dr. Orr are not proofs of the resurrection at all, but of something else. Even if cogent, they have proved the wrong thing; the real point is not touched. In the very nature of the case, the physical phenomena are of possible value only as evidences that the *real* resurrection has taken place. If one thoroughly believes this, as Canon Henson does, without the offered proofs, why must he be asked, against his reason, to

accept the proofs—unless it be simply "because the Bible says so"?

Even in the gospels the physical phenomena are clearly offered from this evidential standpoint. Arnold Meyer[1] has clearly seen this. "The bodily resurrection of Jesus had originally no separate significance for the Christians, but was considered simply as a means of proof for the actuality of the resurrection." Why did Jesus show hands and feet? Why did he eat the broiled fish? Why the repeated appearances? Because the disciples disbelieved the essential fact of the resurrection even after repeated assurances.[2] The story of doubting Thomas is typical here, and the rebuke he met is full of significance: "Because thou hast seen me hast thou believed? Blessed are they that have not seen and have believed."

One has only to try to imagine the sequence of events if the disciples had believed Jesus' oft-repeated promise that he would rise again the third day, had been perfectly certain that after the third day he was alive again, even though they did not see him. Had they thus believed in the resurrection because they believed in Jesus (as Canon Henson would have men do still) it is clear that the details of the story of those forty days would be far less materialistic than they now are. How many of the "appearances," in their present form at least, would fall out of the narrative? Surely Christians of to-day who hold

[1] Arnold Meyer, p. 203.

[2] The cumulative skepticism on the part of the disciples and the corresponding insistence on the materiality of the "appearances" in the later apocryphal accounts are very significant in this connection.

antecedently the resurrection-faith need not be constrained to accept as proofs of that which to them needs no proving external happenings which are wholly incapable of proving it. The tale of these happenings utterly fails to meet the soul's demand. It can prove at most only that the dead body came to life; *it cannot possibly prove anything more.* It tells us only of events inside the sensible realm, of what men have seen and heard, in the material world. But faith cries out to be assured of something beyond the sensible realm, of something which cannot be known through the physical senses, of a spiritual reality which eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard. The demand for such a spiritual reality to feed the hungering soul is met with a stone, with a story of certain happenings entirely within the limits of the physical world, things seen and heard by certain Jewish men and women, which would have been seen and heard by you and me had we been on the scene. The church's vehement insistence is that we are quite wrong when we would identify the reality we seek with a spiritual event, which went on behind the veil, in a world not sensible and material.

Surely this is a sad lowering of standpoint since the apostolic proclamation of the risen Lord as the central element in the religious experience of the believer. The church, indeed, does still claim that religious experience adds to the testimony of gospel history its perpetual witness to the resurrection, but most often such utterance is still based on the material definition of "resurrection," and religious experience is claimed to testify to the events at the tomb, to the angels, the earthquake and the guard, to the body as it comes

forth and walks and talks and eats. It ought to be superfluous, but unfortunately it is not, to point out, as Professor Lake[1] does, that it is "a confusion of thought when men say that spiritual experience can guarantee the historical fact of the Resurrection of the Lord. From the nature of the case it cannot possibly prove anything about the events of the history of Jesus. It can, and does, throw light on the meaning of events which are historically vouched for by other means; but it cannot take the place of these means. * * * Apart from that knowledge of history, it can never tell even Christians anything about the story of his Death and Resurrection."

And I cannot forbear to repeat also the words of Dr. Inge,[2] cited by Professor Lake in this connection: "The inner light can only testify to spiritual truths. It always speaks in the present tense; it cannot guarantee any historical event, past or future. It cannot guarantee either the gospel history or a future judgment. It can tell us that Christ is risen and that He is alive for evermore, but not that He rose again the third day."

The inner light can testify only to spiritual truths; what it assures us in our deepest religious experiences is that Jesus lives, and that we shall live also. The necessary deduction of the mind is that his spirit was not held in the power of death, but rose into the fulness of a new active personal life, amid other than terrestrial conditions, even as also shall we. This, and this only, is the resurrection, in its true meaning. Our appeal is

[1] Lake, Introduction, p. 4.

[2] William R. Inge: *Christian Mysticism*, Bampton Lectures, 1899, p. 326.

from the evangelist to the apostle. Luke says: "And as they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any thing to eat? And they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it and did eat before them." Paul says: "Like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection. * * * If we died with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him. For the death that he died, he died unto sin once for all: but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus."

What have these two passages to do one with the other?

LIST OF WORKS MOST FREQUENTLY CITED

(In the notes these works are cited as follows, commonly by the author's name.)

Allen	Willoughby C. Allen: The Gospel According to St. Matthew (International Critical Commentary), 1907.
Baldensperger	W. Baldensperger: Urchristliche Apologie, 1909.
Bauer	Walter Bauer: Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 1909.
Beyschlag	Willibald Beyschlag: Das Leben Jesu, 4th ed., 1902, vol. i.
Bousset	W. Bousset: Die Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 2d ed., 1906.
Brandt	W. Brandt: Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums, 1893.
Charles	R. H. Charles: Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian, 1899.
Clemen	Carl Clemen: Paulus, 1904, vol. i.
Edersheim	Alfred Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2d ed., 1884, vol. ii.
Haller	W. Haller: Die Lehre von der Auferstehung des Fleisches bis auf Tertullian, in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1892, pp. 274–342.
Harnack (Dogmengeschichte)	Adolf Harnack: Dogmengeschichte, 3d ed., vol. i., 1894.
Harnack (Altch. Lit.)	Adolf Harnack: Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, vol. i., 1893.
Harnack (Chronologie)	Adolf Harnack: Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur, vol. i., 1897.

Harnack (Lukas d. Artzt)	Adolf Harnack: Lukas der Artzt, 1906.
Harnack (Apostelgeschichte)	Adolf Harnack: Die Apostelgeschichte, 1908.
Hennecke (Apok.)	Edgar Hennecke: Die Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 1904.
Hennecke (Handbuch)	Edgar Hennecke: Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 1904.
Holsten	Carl Holsten: Zum Evangelium des Petrus und Paulus, 1868.
Holtzmann (N. T. Theol.)	H. J. Holtzmann: Neutestamentliche Theologie, vols. i. and ii., 1897.
Holtzmann (H. C.)	H. J. Holtzmann: Hand-Commentar: Die synoptischen Evangelien, 3d ed., 1901.
Holtzmann (H. C. Acta)	H. J. Holtzmann: Hand-Commentar: Die Apostelgeschichte, 3d ed., 1901.
O. Holtzmann	Oskar Holtzmann: Das Leben Jesu, 1901.
Keim	Theodor Keim: Die Geschichte Jesu von Nazara, vol. iii., 1872. Eng. tr., vol. vi., 1883.
Kennedy	H. A. A. Kennedy: St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, 1904.
Korff	Theodor Korff: Die Auferstehung Christi und die Radikale Theologie, 1908.
Lake	Kirsopp Lake: The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, 1907.
Latham	Henry Latham: The Risen Master. Seventh Thousand, 1907.
Le Breton	Paul Le Breton: La Résurrection du Christ, 1908.
Loisy	Alfred Loisy: Les Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. i., 1907; vol. ii., 1908.
Loofs	F. Loofs: Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert, 3d ed., 1908.
Martineau	James Martineau: The Seat of Authority in Religion, 4th ed., 1898.
Maurenbrecher	Max Maurenbrecher: Von Nazareth nach Golgotha, 1909.

Merx	Adalbert Merx: Die vier Kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Text. Part ii., First Half (Matthew), 1902. Second Half (Mark and Luke), 1905.
Arnold Meyer	Arnold Meyer: Die Auferstehung Christi, 1905.
Meyer–Weiss	H. A. W. Meyer's Kritischexegetisches Kommentar über das N. T., 9th ed. Das Matthäus-Evangelium, 1898; Das Marcus-Evangelium und das Lukas-Evangelium, 1901; Das Johannes-Evangelium, 1902. Edited by Bernhard Weiss.
Milligan	William Milligan: The Resurrection of our Lord. The Croall Lecture for 1879–80. 6th Thousand, 1894.
Orr	James Orr: The Resurrection of Jesus, 1908.
Pfleiderer	Otto Pfleiderer: Das Urchristentum, 2d ed., vol. i., 1902.
Plummer	Alfred Plummer: The Gospel According to St. Luke (International Critical Commentary), 2d ed., 1896.
Reville	Albert Reville: Jésus de Nazareth, 1897. Vols. i. and ii.
Riggenbach	E. Riggenbach: Die Auferstehung Jesu, 2d ed., 1908.
Rohrbach (Schluss)	Paul Rohrbach: Der Schluss des Markus-Evangeliums, 1894.
Rohrbach (Berichte)	Paul Rohrbach: Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi, 1898.
Schmidt	Nathanael Schmidt: The Prophet of Nazareth, 1905.
O. Schmiedel	Otto Schmiedel: Die Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu Forschung, 2d ed., 1906.
Schmiedel	P. W. Schmiedel: "Resurrection and Ascension Narratives," in Encyclopedia Biblica, vol. iv., 1903. Quoted by column.
Schriften des N. T.	Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Ed. Johannes Weiss. vol. i., 1906., vol. ii., 1907.

Schwartzkopff	Paul Schwartzkopff: The Prophecies of Jesus Christ Relating to His Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming, Eng. tr., 1897. Cited only from the English version.
Schweitzer	A. Schweitzer: Von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906.
Staudt	Calvin K. Staudt: The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period, 1909.
Steude	E. G. Steude· Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi, 2d ed., 1893.
Supernatural Religion	(Walter R. Cassels): Supernatural Religion, Popular ed., 1902.
Teichmann	Ernst Teichmann: Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht, 1896.
Thackeray	H. St. John Thackeray: The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, 1900.
Tischendorf	Constantin Tischendorf: Novum Testamentum Græce Editio Octava Critica Major, 1869–1872.
Voigt	H. G. Voigt: Die Ältesten Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi, 1906.
Volkmar	Gustav Volkmar: Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien, 1876.
Völter	Daniel Völter: Die Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu, 1910.
Volz	Paul Volz: Jüdische Eschatologie, 1903.
Von Dobschütz	Ernst von Dobschütz: Ostern und Pfingsten, 1903.
Weizsäcker	Carl Weizsäcker: Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche. 2d ed., 1892.
Wellhausen (Ev. Marci)	J. Wellhausen: Das Evangelium Marci, 1903.
Wellhausen (Ev. Mat.)	J. Wellhausen: Das Evangelium Matthæi, 1904.
Wellhausen (Ev. Lucæ)	J. Wellhausen: Das Evangelium Lucæ, 1904.
Wellhausen (Ev. Joh.)	J. Wellhausen: Das Evangelium Johannis, 1908.
Wernle	Paul Wernle: Die Anfänge unserer Religion. 2d ed., 1904.

W.–H.	B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort: The New Testament in the Original Greek. Edition of 1898.
Zahn (Gesch.d.Kan.)	Theodor Zahn: Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons, vol. i., First Half, 1888. Second Half 1889. Vol. ii., First Half, 1890. Second Half 1892.
Zahn (Forschungen)	Theodor Zahn: Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. In six parts, 1881, 1883, 1884, 1891, 1893, 1900.
Zahn (Einleitung)	Theodor Zahn: Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 2d ed., 1900. Vols. i. and ii.

INDEX

(Of the text only, not of the footnotes. References to pages.)

A

Acts of Pilate, 350–352
Adam, second, 128 f.
Ambrosius, 325
Angel inseparable from empty grave, 187–195, 207
Apocalypse of Baruch, 91 f.
Apocalypse of Elijah, 20
Apology of Aristides, 367
Apparent death, theory of, 212–216
Appearances, nature of, 41–69; reality of, 68 f.; place of, 430–440; date of, 432–434; importance of, 455 f.
Aristion, 338
Ascension of Isaiah, 366 f.
Ascension of Jesus, 350–373; date of, 365; same as resurrection, 355 f., 363–368, 418, 471
Auditory phenomena with appearances, 48 f.
Augustine, 4, 375

B

Bacon, 367 f., 371, 419
Beyschlag, 42–44, 46 f., 55, 108, 167 f., 172, 434
Bickell, 201
Body, final fate of Jesus', 454
Brandt, 158, 305, 334, 425
Breaking of bread, 318 f.
Briggs, 461 f.
Bunsen, 213
Burial of Jesus, 37 f., 239–249, 296 f., 391 f.
Burial not necessary to resurrection, 111–113

C

Catacombs, 381
Charles, 73 f., 91, 96, 367
Chrysostom, 375
Clement of Alexandria, 389
Clement of Rome, 367
Codex *Bobbiensis*, 366
Conybeare, 338
Coptic resurrection-fragment, 342–344

D

Diatessaron, 426
Didache, 367
Didaskalia, 425 f.
Dods, 211
Doubt-motive, 280–282, 302–304, 335–344

E

Ἐκ νεκρῶν, 38 f.
Emmaus episode, 305–332, 353 f.
Empty grave legendary, 205–237; natural explanations of, 212–225; origin of legend of, 233–235
Ephraem Syrus, 426
Epistle of Barnabas, 365

"Ethical resurrection," 125
Eucharist-motive, 318 f., 378–381, 415
Eusebius, 339, 346, 384 f.

F

Fairbairn, 473
Faith and historic knowledge, 459–466
Fayoum fragment, 200 f.
Fish-symbol, 381
Five hundred, appearance to, 430 f., 433
Fourth Ezra, 358
Fourth Gospel, origin and character of, 389–391, 398; relation to Luke, 391
Freer MS., 339–341

G

Galilee, disappearance of, in the tradition, 383–386, 408 f.; early mission in, 434–440
Gfrörer, 213
Gospel of the Hebrews, 346, 381 f., 423 f., 425, 433
Gospel of Peter, 169–179, 185 f., 200, 250, 365 f., 426
Gregory, 340
Guard at tomb, 254, 264–273
Gunkel, 25

H

Haller, 144
Harnack, 170–173, 342
Hase, 213
Hegesippus, 384
Henson, 474–476
Herder, 212
Hermas, 367
Holsten, 51, 55, 61
Holtzmann, H., 217 f., 377

I

Ignatius, 345 f., 367, 381 f.
Inge, 478
Intellectualism in Corinth, 80 f.
Irenæus, 367

J

James, appearance to, 423–425, 433
Jerome, 338–341, 346, 375, 424 f.
"Jerusalem tradition," 281 f., 296
Jonah 27, 32 f.
Joseph of Arimathea, 240–243, 296
Josephus, 73, 109 f., 156, 241, 258, 447
Justin, 367, 382

K

Keim, 41, 43 f., 53–55, 60 f., 183
Kennedy, H. A. A., 103 f., 144
Kennedy, John, 473
Kinkel, 369 f.
Korff, 85 f.

L

Lake, 64 f., 91 f., 114, 191–194, 204, 263, 470, 478
Loofs, 159
Luke, 290; divergence from Paul, 149, 479

M

Mark, 151, 236; lost end of gospel of, 160–179
Martineau, 2, 111
Matthew, gospel of, 238 f.
Merx, 250 f., 328
Messiahship of Jesus, 420 f., 441–444
Meyer, Arnold, 211, 476
Meyer, H. A. W., 369
Milligan, 41, 44, 468–470
Mînôkhirad, 21 f.

Moëd Katon, 19
Mountain where Jesus appeared, 275 f., 282–284, 349–352
Myers, 65 f.

O

Olshausen, 468 f.
Origen, 323–325, 332, 346
Orr, 67 f., 267 f., 473, 475
ὤφθη, 41 f.

P

Papias, 151, 338
Paulus, 212
Petri Doctrina, 346
Pfleiderer, 56, 110, 447
Pistis Sophia, 22
Polycarp, 367
Pre-existence of Messiah, 128
Prophecies of his resurrection, Jesus', 444–452
Psalms of Solomon, 73
Psychic research and the appearances, 63–68

R

Reimarus, 225
"Religionsgeschichtliche Methode," 23–25
Renan, 51
Resch, 326
Rest of the Words of Baruch, 31
Resurrection defined, 76; limited to righteous, 72–74; not the same as immortality, 77–79; a Jewish conception, 79 f.; not dependent on burial, 111–113, 449 f.
Resurrection-body not buried body, 82–94
Resurrection of Jesus not described in N. T., 7, 289, 472; how unique, 118–121, 467–470; time of, 251–253, 269
Reville, 206, 219
Robinson, 467 f.
Rohrbach, 167, 170, 172, 225, 228, 326
Rolleston, 220

S

Salvation, Paul's conception of, 125–136
Schahrastani, 366
Schleiermacher, 213
Schmiedel, 42, 48, 51–53, 55, 108–110, 114, 369, 395
Schwartzkopff, 224 f.
Scripture prophecy of third day, 10–17, 32–34
See the dominant word of the earliest data, 49, 279
σῶμα defined, 94–96
Sources of material on the resurrection, 5
Stevens, 39
Strauss, 51
Stülcken, 171
Swete, 171
Syllabus *Lamentabili Sane Exitu*, 463

T

Table of appearances, 428 f.
Tacitus, 436
Tatian, 426
Teichmann, 104
"Telegram from heaven," 44 f., 54
Tertullian, 220 f., 367, 437
Thackeray, 91
Theophilus of Antioch, 30
Theophylact, 375
Third day, 10–35; originally fixed by Jesus, 12–15; idiomatic use of, 18; Persian origin of, 19–22; mythological origin of, 25–31; equivalent to "after three days," 30 f.; not date of first appearance, 34 f., 432
Toldoth Jeschu, 221–223

Tombs, Palestinian, 244
Transfiguration, 419–423
Tristram, 411

V

Values of bodily resurrection, 77, 466–470
Vendîdâd, 20
Virgin birth, 461 f.
Vision defined, 45 f.; nature of visions of Jesus, 46 f.
Vision-hypothesis, 51–62; and psychology, 56 f.; illegitimate objections to, 56–61; valid objection to, 61 f.
Volz, 90
Von Dobschütz, 225, 227, 331
Von Soden, 110

W

Weizsäcker, 385, 439
Wellhausen, 419
Wernle, 103
Westcott, 468
When It Was Dark, 465
Wilson, 411
Women at grave, episode of, legendary, 186 f.; appearance to, legendary, 262–264, 395 f., 429 f.

Y

Yasht XXII, 20 f.

Z

Zahn, 325 f., 426

CHIEF NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES

Matthew

10:17–42, 439; **14:29,** 416; **16:18 f.,** 285 f.; **26:32,** 199; **27:52 f.,** 109, 295; **27:57–61,** 246–249; **27:62,** 246; **27:62–66; 28:4, 11–15,** 264–273; **28:1–8,** 249–259; **28:1,** 185; **28:7,** 199; **28:8–20,** 164–166; **28:9 f.,** 259–262, 395; **28:16–20,** 275–289; **28:17,** 279–282, 344; **28:18,** 361 f.

Mark

1:17, 403 f.; **3:13 f.,** 404–407; **6:7–13,** 404; **9:9 f.,** 322, 422 f.; **10:28–40,** 404; **12:24–27,** 73; **13:9–13,** 405; **14:8,** 234; **14:28,** 195–201; **15:42–47,** 239–248; **16:1–8,** 152–237; **16:4,** 186; **16:8,** 159; **16:9–20,** 337–342

Luke

4:42–44, 408; **5:1–11,** 179, 401–414; **8:2 f.,** 303; **9:44 f.,** 300 f.; **9:51,** 359; **10:1–17,** 306; **19:29–37,** 349; **20:35 f.,** 74; **22:31 ff.,** 198, 387; **23:51,** 242; **24:1–12,** 291–305; **24:6 f.,** 198; **24:10,** 302 f.; **24:12,** 304 f., 394; **24:13–34,** 305–332; **24:22–24,** 316; **24:25,** 448 f.; **24:26,** 360; **24:32,** 320 f.; **24:34,** 323–328, 387 f.; **24:36 ff.,** 334, 376; **24:40,** 345; **24:41,** 416; **24:47–49,** 349; **24:50 f.,** 349, 352–373; **24:51,** 371 f.; **24:52 f.,** 378 f.

John

6:30–59, 380; **7:39,** 363; **14:16–28,** 363; **15:26,** 363; **16:7,** 363; **16:22,** 397; **19:39 f.,** 185; **20:1–29,** 392–398; **20:17–23,** 362 f.; **20:29,** 393; **21:1–14,** 166–169, 178 f., 380, 399–419

Acts

1:1–11, 359 f., 374–386; **1:3,** 336; **1:4,** 374–382; **1:4–12,** 349; **1:6–13,** 407; **1:14,** 379; **1:21–26,** 306; **2:1–4,** 430 f.; **2:22–35,** 365; **2:32,** 209; **2:42–47,** 378 f.; **3:15,** 209; **4:2,** 209; **4:33,** 209; **7:26,** 41 f.; **9:4–6,** 48; **9:31,** 384; **10:1–11:17,** 312; **10:9 ff.,** 413; **10:40,** 336; **10:41,** 375 f.; **12:1–12,** 43 f.; **13:29,** 243; **15:3,** 383; **22:7–10,** 48; **26:14–18,** 48; **26:20,** 383

Romans

1:4, 118, 139 f.; **3:10–12,** 127; **3:16 f.,** 127 f.; **3:23,** 127; **4:17,** 140, 144; **4:24 f.,** 140; **5:10,** 140, 142; **5:12–6:11,** 88; **6:1–11,** 37 f., 140 f.; **6:4,** 125; **6:6,** 141; **7:1,** 130; **7:1–6,** 141 f.; **8:3,** 138 f.; **8:9,** 142; **8:10 f.,** 88, 142 f.; **8:12 f.,** 145; **8:23,** 104, 146; **8:29–39,**

Romans—*Continued*
146; 8:34, 363 f.; 10:9–13, 147; 12:1, 104; 14:8 f., 143, 145 f.; 16:7, 330

First Corinthians

6:12–20, 97; 6:14, 145; 6:19 f., 105; 9:1, 49, 137; 15:1–54, 7–115; 15:8 f., 432

Second Corinthians

1:9, 143 f.; 4:14, 145; 5:1–10, 98–102; 5:1 f., 89; 5:5, 146; 5:14–17, 88, 139; 13:4, 140

Galatians

1:1, 136; 1:11 f., 317; 1:12, 137; 1:15 f., 136 f.; 2:2, 48; 2:19–21, 137; 3:1, 138; 3:27 f., 88; 5:16–25, 139; 5:24, 138; 6:14 f., 138

Ephesians

1:20, 2:5 f., 4:8–10, 364

Colossians

1:1–3:17, 147; 1:13, 122, 139; 1:18, 71, 121; 1:22, 142; 3:1, 125; 3:1–4, 147 f., 3:9–11, 88; 3:11, 147

Philippians

1:20–24, 102–104; 2:9, 140; 3:3–11, 88; 3:8–11, 148 f.; 3:10–14, 72; 3:10–21, 104; 3:11, 72, 96; 3:20 f., 104

First Thessalonians

1:10, 117 f., 121 f.; 3:13, 123; 4:2–8, 98; 4:13–18, 73, 122–124; 5:9 f., 122; 5:23, 98

Hebrews

1:3, 10:12, 12:2, 13:20, 364

First Peter

3:21 f., 364